



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REPORTS.

REVUE DE PHILOGIE, DE LITTÉRATURE ET D' HISTOIRE ANCIENNES. (Edited by ÉD. TOURNIER, L. HAVET AND CH. GRAUX: Paris.) 1877. Vol. I. (New Series.)¹

1. pp. 7-24. The importance of a knowledge of epigraphy in interpreting certain classic works (A letter to L. Havet from E. Desjardins). This letter discusses the fourth Silva of the First Book of Statius, and criticises translations of this work, taking that of Rinn (one of the best) as a sample, and points out various errors which would have been avoided by a thorough knowledge of the Roman *cursus honorum*, and of certain inscriptions. The article throws much light on the history of the hero of this Silva, C. Rutilius Gallicus. [The article exhibits acute critical powers and is clear and methodical. At one point, where the opinion is expressed that *gemi*, *geminati*, denote simultaneous *doubling* rather than *succession*, we miss an allusion to an exception in "*tergeminis honoribus*," especially as these very *honores* are the subject under discussion.]

2. pp. 189-192. Second letter to Havet from Desjardins on the same subject. Making use of an inscription (Vol. VI, p. 444, of the *Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum*), the author establishes some further details, especially in the *cursus honorum* of C. Rutilius Gallicus, showing also the date of his death to have been A. D. 92—the very year to which his death had been assigned by combination in the previous letter.

3. pp. 25-34. The Epitaph of the Athenians slain at Chaeronea, cited in the *De Corona* § 289 (By Henri Weil). A defence of the authenticity of the Epitaph, showing that the passage formerly attributed to Gaetulicus, but shown by Kaibel to be much earlier (and hence believed to be the genuine Epitaph), cannot be the true Epitaph of the Athenians; and producing strong arguments in defence of the one cited in Demosthenes, which the author amends as follows: v. 1, he changes *ἐνεκα* to *μὲν ἐκάς*; v. 3, *ἀρετῆς* to *ἀρεως*; v. 5, *ζυγὸν αὐχένι θέντες* to *ζυγὶ αὐχένα δόντες*; v. 10, *ἐν βιοτῇ* . . . *φνγεῖν* to *αἰχμητῇν* . . . *φνγών*. [If the MSS. gave the form to which Weil reduces the Epitaph no one would doubt its authenticity; but the changes are unpleasantly numerous and a little violent.]

4. pp. 35-39. Attic Orthography according to Inscriptions (By Paul Foucart). a) *Υῖός* and *γυῖός*, according to the grammarian Theognostus, were spelled *ύός*, *γυός*, at Athens. For *ύός* his statement is verified by numerous inscriptions, the forms found being *ύός*, *ύού*, *ύόν*; *ύεις*, *ύών*, *ύεις*. The Inscriptions run from B. C. 409 down to the Roman conquest, when *υῖός* begins to appear. b) *θάλασσα* vs. *θάλαττα*: the latter (-ττ-) is the only form found in (seven) inscriptions, B. C. 425-324. So *τέτταρες*, *τετταράκοντα*. c) *ἦν* and *ἄν*

¹In the case of the *Revue de Philologie*, as in the case of other journals of recent establishment, it has been thought best to begin with the beginning for the sake of completeness.—ED.

(for *έάν*) are never found in Attic inscriptions. *d*) *So λητοργία* or *ληιτοργία* (not *λειτ-*) in (three) inscriptions before our era (supported also by authority of grammarians). *e*) *Κωλαγρέται* should be *κωλακρέται* (Corp. Inscr. Att. 20, 37, 45, 93, 285). *f*) No inscription gives *έρρηφορείν*, one of late date gives *άρρηφορείν*, while the common form is *έρρηφορείν*. *g*) *Φλεάσιοι*, not *Φλιάσιοι*, is found. *h*) Thuc. v. 18; *Σκώλος*, correct *Στῶλος*; *Σιγγαίους*, corr. *Σιγγίους* or *Σινγίους*, *Στάγειρος* and *Στάγιρος* not found in inscriptions, but only *Σταγυρίται*.

5. pp. 40-54 and 284-261. *Emendationes ad T. Livium* (By A. Harant). Some forty conjectures, many of which are quite convincing.

6. pp. 55-85. Coricius, Eulogy of Aratius and Stephanus; published for the first time from the MS. (N—101) in the Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid (By Ch. Graux). Aratius, a distinguished subordinate of Belisarius, was, at the time of the oration, Dux Palaestinae, while Stephanus was civil governor (*consularis*) of Palestine. The oration throws some light on certain obscure portions of history, and presents some facts entirely new; but the allusions are for the most part vague, the oration being addressed to Aratius and Stephanus personally (at Gaza) and all others present being presumed to know the facts to which allusion is made. (The editor, Ch. Graux, has added valuable critical notes, and gives an interesting discussion of what is meant by *διαλέξεις*.)

7. p. 85. Restoration of a passage of Epicurus (By J. Lachelier). The passage, cited by Diogenes Laertius, 10, 142, is to be read: . . . *έτι τε τὸ μὴ κατανοεῖν τοῦς ὅρους κτλ.* On p. 200 Lachelier again briefly discusses the same passage.

8. pp. 86-90. Observations on certain passages of Cicero de Officiis (By Ch. Thurot). Discusses Cicero's Latin equivalents for the Stoic *σωφροσύνη*, and its subdivisions, *εὐταξία* (*ordo*), *κοσμήτης* (*ornatus*), *αἰδώς* (*verecundia*), etc., etc. Cicero himself confesses (35, 126) that the Greek words are *difficiles ad eloquendum*.

9. pp. 91-100 (fine print). Obituary notice of F. Ritschl, with an account of his Life and Labors (By E. Benoist).

10. pp. 101-165. Critical study of the Letters of Seneca to Lucilius (By Émile Chatelain). Discussion of the MSS. of the first thirteen books (p, P, and *Paris. b*); criticism of previous collations. Discussion of some fifty passages, with various conjectures. Complete collation of *p* (*Paris, Bibl. Nat. No. 8540*) and partial collations of *P* and *Paris. b*. Then follow observations on the errors of *p*, such as one consonant for two and *vice versa*, *h* added or omitted, *ae* for *e*, *oe* for *e*, *a* for *e*, *a* for *o*, *a* for *au*, *o* for *a*, *a* for *u*, *u* for *a*, *e* for *a*, *e* for *i*, *e* for *o*, *o* for *e*, *e* for *u*, *e* for *it*, *i* for *e*, *i* for *u* or *ii*, *i* for *t*, *t* for *i*, *u* for *b*, *u* for *i*, *u* for *o*, *ur* added, *us* added or omitted. The letter *c* appears to have been dropped about loose, sometimes falling between words, as *itura c ratio*, sometimes in the middle of words, as *credidimus*. Further *c* is used for *qu*, *qu* for *c*, *c* for *g*, *g* for *c*, *c* for *t*, *t* for *c*, *c* for *x*, *x* for *c*, *d* for *t*, *t* for *d*. Then we have substitution of words that bear a resemblance, as *amicos* for *animos*, and finally assimilation a) of a word to one preceding it, as *aliquam faciam* (for *faciem*); b) more frequently of a word to one following it, as *opinionem damni* for *opinioni damni*. [The author's surprise at this last is without good cause.] All the examples of these errors are printed in columns. The author discusses, further, arbitrary corrections by copyists, and closes with a note on two Vatican MSS. (2207 and 1454).

11. pp. 165-7. *Varia* (By L. Havet). Discussion (with conjectures) of passages of Statius, Commodianus, Lutatii Placidi *glossae*, Apuleius, Pacuvius. [Some of the conjectures are quite satisfying.]

12. pp. 168-181. On the Authenticity of the Law of Euagoras cited in Demosthenes against Meidias § 10 (By Paul Foucart). The authenticity of such pieces is not to be discussed in a general way, but each must be examined to itself; whereby we find that some are mere inventions, some are modifications, and some, exact quotations. The passage in question, if genuine, is one of importance because of the light it sheds on some of the Athenian Festivals. The arguments of Westermann, who pronounces the Law spurious, are taken up in detail and ably confuted. The most important point is to show that the Dionysia of the Piraeus was not a Festival *κατ' ἀγρούς* (as Westermann maintains), but was a city Festival; and this the author does by sound arguments based on inscriptions. The words *καὶ οἱ παῖδες καὶ ὁ κῶμος* receive a striking explanation.

13. pp. 182-188. Scholia on Thucydides (Published by L. Duchesne; furnished by Ἰω. Σακκελίων). Taken from a MS. of Patmos of the tenth century. These Scholia are of some value; for instance, in Thuc. vi 74: *ἀπελθόντες ἐς Νάξον καὶ Θράκας* (*sic*, Bekker), *στανρώματα περὶ τὸ στρατόπεδον ποιησάμενοι αὐτοῦ διεχέμαζον*, the words *καὶ Θράκας* make nonsense; and yet no principle of criticism justifies their suppression. Now the MS. of Patmos gives *ὅρα καὶ* for *Θράκας* and explains *ὅρα* as "fortified places, now called *ὅρια*," which word (*ὅριον*) Hesychius defines *τείχισμα, φραγμὸν*. It is evident that ΟΡΑΚΑΙ (*ὅρα* being a *ῥα*-prefix) was mistaken for ΘΡΑΚΑΣ.

14. pp. 193-204. Critical Notes (By various authors). *a*) By Henri Weil: Conjectures on Eur. Tro. 477 sq., 587 sq., 531 sq., 1187, 383 sq. Herod. VII 161: for *οὐκ ὄνειδος* read *οὐκ ἀεικές*. Dion Chrysost., Vol. II, p. 433 (Reiske): for *παχεία* read *παγχρύσεις*. Ausonius, Epist. X 47: for *non Poena* read *non προῖκα*. *b*) By J. Lachelier: Sextus Empiricus, p. 246, 17 (Bekker): for *οὐκ εἶχε δὲ αὐτὴν* read *οὐκ εἶκε δὲ αὐτῇ*. *c*) By Max Bonnet: Stobaeus, Florilegium, 40, 7: the quotation (assigned to Democritus) broken up and changed into two iambic trimeters, and assigned to Euripides. Hor. Epist. I 17, 31: for *chlamydem* read *chlanidem*. *d*) By Éd. Tournier: Conjectures on Herod. I 89; 108; II 141; III 14 (bis); 79; VII 101. Babrius v. 15-16: read *οἶμον Αἰσώπον μύθοις φράσαντος*. Epicurus (Diog. Laert., X 132): read *διδάσκουσα* or *διδάσκονσά γ'* instead of *διδάσκουσαι*. Aesch. Pers., 189: for *μαθῶν* read *μολῶν*. *e*) By H. Dulac: Lucian, Dial. Deor. XXI 2, read *αὐτῷ τῷ κερανῶ* [*καὶ βροντῇ*].

15. pp. 204-205. Quos ego (By Ch. Thurot). These words (as is shown by examples from Cicero) are equivalent to "Illos quidem ego" (i. e., the rel. followed by *ego* implies a concession which introduces an objection).

16. pp. 206-8. Palaeographic Notes (By Ch. Graux). *a*) Xen. Mem., I Prooem. 3, 7: *πολλοὺς* (vulg. *πολλοῖς*) *δειπνίζουσιν* found in MS. No. 1302, Paris. This is one of the best MSS.: imperfectly collated by Dübner. *b*) Montfaucon, Palaeogr. Graec. pp. 43 and 257, mistakes for *Διόδωρος* a sort of monogram of Ἰωάννης διώρθωσα or διώρθωσεν, in MS No. 2179, Paris. *c*) Some points with regard to the age of *bombycini*. The Greek MS. No. 990, Paris, is *not* a *bombycinus* but a *membranaceus*; while Gr. MS. 154 is of the thirteenth century (not as old as has been supposed). *d*) Note on the Escorialensis Φ-III-8 of Philostratus, Apollon.

Tyan. Collation of three passages, showing the proper place of this MS. among the others (of this work). *e*) In the monastery of San Lorenzo del Escorial, among other relics, is a MS. "that once belonged to St. John Chrysostom." It has these words written on it *prima manu*: κτῆμα τοῦ ἀγίου Ἰωάννου Χρυσοστόμου! It is a book of Evangelists, written in uncial letters in the eighth or ninth century, with accents and musical notes; but the question is, how John Chrysostom came to be canonized before his death.

17. p. 208. A fragment of Hyperides: πάντων ἀπαιδευτότατον τὸ λαιδορεῖν (cited by Dion. Antioch.).

18. pp. 209-247. Choricus, Apology of the Mimes, published for the first time from the MS. (N-101) of the Bibl. Nacional de Madrid (By Ch. Graux). This oration gives some new details in regard to the history of the Theatre in the times of Justinian, as well as some fragments, partly new, of various authors. Valuable critical notes are added. [The oration is ingenious enough, but in places ridiculous, as where, having called attention to the fact that the gods on various occasions assumed the forms of men, etc., he asks indignantly: θεῶν οὖν μιμουμένων, τίνα τρόπον ἀνθρώποις ἐγκλημα γίνεται μίμησις;]

19. p. 247. Parody in Aristophanes (By Éd. Tournier). Calls attention to the excellent work of W. H. van de Sande Bakhuysen, *De parodia in comoediis Aristophanis*, and asks whether Wasps, 1031 seq., is not a parody on the description of Scylla in the Odyssey.

20. pp. 248-253. Correction of Hor. Od. III 14, 12 (By L. Quicherat), iam virum expertae *male ominatis* into *male inominatis*. Some MSS. give *nominitatis*, which points to the rare word *inominatis*, found only in one other place, and that, too, in Horace (Epod. 16, 38): *inominati perprimat cubilia*.

21. p. 253. A brief Note (by Éd. Tournier) showing that πλείων in some passages means "in addition," "besides"; as Thuc. I 36. In Soph. Phil., 576, and Oed. Col. 36, it *must* be so interpreted.

22. p. 261. Note (by Tournier) on Plutarch, *De exsil.*, pp. 600-601: putting τῇν before ἐν Ἀθήναις, and changing βελτίονα into καλλίονα.

23. pp. 262-3. Notes on Greek grammar (By Ch. Graux). *a*) Nouns in -εῖς had nom. pl. ῆς till about 380. The word ΧΑΛΚΙΔΕΕΣ in a decree of 446-5 is to be read Χαλκιδεῆς and not Χαλκιδέες. *b*) Fem. Dual: the author removes some obstacles to the view that the fem. dual sometimes had a form distinct from the masc.

24. pp. 264-6. The gods of Epicurus (By J. Lachelier). A discussion of the physical nature of the gods, based on the *De Natura Deorum*. The atomic theory plays an important part in the discussion.

25. pp. 267-288. Notes on various ancient authors (By several persons). Critical discussion of passages in Aeschylus, Demosthenes, Euripides, Herodotus, Thucydides, Antipater (Anth. Pal.), Longus, Caesar, Pliny (Nat. Hist.), Vitruvius, Arnobius (observations on the MSS. of Optatianus); Vegetius. [Some of these notes are interesting and important.]

The REVUE DES REVUES, appended to the REVUE DE PHILOGIE and exceeding it in volume, gives, in the most condensed form, the substance of all important classical articles in Reviews, Transactions of Societies, etc., published in Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Egypt, France, Germany, Great Britain, Greece,

Holland, Italy, Luxembourg, Norway, Russia, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, and the United States. For each country there is an *editor-general*, who employs others to assist him when necessary; and M. CHARLES GRAUX is *editor-in-chief*.

REVUE DE PHILOLOGIE. Vol. II, 1878.

1. pp. 1-10. Relations of Linguistic Science to Philology (Letter to Éd. Tournier from Michel Bréal). The author denies that these two branches of knowledge are entirely distinct, and in order to show how much Philology owes to Linguistic Science, he mentions some of the absurd etymologies proposed by scholars before the new science removed the *πρῶτον ψεῦδος*, and employs other strong arguments.

2. pp. 11-14. Choriciana (Letter to Ch. Graux from Th. Gomperz). Discusses a dozen passages in the works of Choricus published by Graux in the *Revue de Philologie* (1877), making several conjectures. One point may be mentioned. In the Apology of the Mimes, XVIII 2, we read: *φασὶ τὸν εἰρηκότα τὴν ὑπὲρ ἧς ἀγωνίζομαι τέχνην, ἐξ ὧν πάντα φησὶν ἀπαγγέλλειν ὁ προσηγορία μὲν δεύτερος τὴν τάξιν δὲ πρῶτος, ἐκείνου* (Philemon) *δὴ λέγουσι καὶ τὸν παῖδα τὸν Διοσίθου* (Menander) *ἡλικιώτας τ' ἄμφω κτέ.* Graux had invited Philologists to explain the clause *ἐξ ὧν . . . πρῶτος*. Gomperz suggests as the most plausible explanation, that *δεύτερος* refers to *Secundus*, author of four extant Epigrams, who was probably a contemporary of Choricus. [This interpretation, I may say, occurred to me also the first time I read the sentence.]

To this article Graux adds, among other things, a note from Prof. Ussing: According to Choricus (Apol. Mim., IX 3), Smicrines, the Miser of Menander, feared *μή τι τῶν ἔνδον ὁ καπνὸς οἰχαιτο φέρων*, which is exactly what is said of the Miser of Plautus (*Aulularia*, v. 300):

Quin divom atque hominum clamat continuo fidem,
Suam rem perisse seque eradicarier
De suo tigillo fumus si qua exit foras.

Tigillum here is *not* the log on the fire, but the beam on which hams, etc., were hung to be smoked.

3. pp. 15-18. Appius Claudius and Spurius Carvilius (By L. Havet). Discusses the expulsion of Z from the old Latin Alphabet by Appius Claudius, and the substitution for it of G, invented by Carvilius. The two events must have been nearly or quite simultaneous, and it may be that C., born about B. C. 310, was a protégé of Appius.

4. pp. 19-57. *Novae Lectiones Euripideae* (By H. van Herwerden). Nearly two hundred conjectures.

5. pp. 58-61. L. Duvius Avitus (By R. Mowat). The author shows from inscriptions found at Pompeii that the name was *Duvius*, and not *Dubius* nor *Vibius*—shapes under which it appears in MSS. of Pliny and Tacitus.

6. p. 61. Note (by Éd. Tournier) replying to a criticism of Cobet on Choricus, Aratius VII, 2, <νν> <γν> *γνῆ καὶ παιδίον*, and showing that the true reading is *ννὶ καὶ παιδίον*.

7. pp. 62-64. Hor. Od. I 2, 39-40 (By E. Benoist). *Mauri peditis*. B. opposes the "emendation" of *Mauri* into *Marsi*, and the interpretation of

peditis as "a horseman dismounted"; and defends the common reading and natural interpretation, showing that they are not inconsistent with historical facts. Possibly *peditis* is used to suggest that the enemy (*hostem*) is mounted.

8. p. 64. (By λ.) A passage of Arnobius (I 59) proves that the circumflex and the acute were pronounced differently.

9. pp. 65-77. An Unedited Letter of Harpocraton to an Emperor. Published from MS. N—110, Biblioteca Nacional de Madrid (By Ch. Graux). This MS. contains the hermetic collection known as the *Kypavίδες*. This Harpocraton is probably the H. who was the friend of Libanius, and may have been identical with Valerius H. whose name appears at the head of the Lexicon of the Ten Orators. The letter contains evidence that it was written after the decline of the magic art, and yet the writer is evidently an advocate of magic; hence the inference that the emperor addressed was Julian the Apostate, as there was no other emperor of that period to whom one would have dared to send such a letter. These points are carefully discussed by Graux in an introduction, and the letter itself is accompanied by very valuable notes, critical and exegetical. Especially interesting are the notes (40 and 81) on *lecanomancy* and *ἀκτανοβολία*. The letter is incomplete and would appear to have been sent along with a copy of King Necepso's Book of Fourteen Remedies. It is not uninteresting, and it is difficult to determine whether the writer was a charlatan or a dupe. Having studied successfully in Asia, he goes to Alexandria and learns the healing art; but on attempting to put into practice the remedies and astrological appliances of Necepso, he makes a signal failure. Wandering about in despair, and "praying without ceasing" for divine aid, he finally meets with a priest in Diospolis (Thebes), who still understands lecanomancy, and grants him an interview with Asclepius himself in real presence. The god commences a lecture on astrological pharmaceutics—and the MS. breaks off, but not in time to save the lecturer, god as he is, from two stupid blunders (Harpocraton, however, does not see them).

10. pp. 78-83. Variations taken from a MS. of Justin of the twelfth century (By Al. Harant). The MS. in question is in the library of Laon, and seems to be one of the most important MSS. of Justin. In the article before us about thirty passages are discussed by means of new variations furnished by this MS. The date (1139) and the copyist's name are recorded on it thus:

Alrici studeo liber est hic script' in anno
Tredeties deno milleno ter quoq; terno.

11. pp. 84-92. Critical Observations (By H. Weil). *a*) On the Ionian prose-writers: emendations of certain fragments of Pherecydes of Syros, Hecataeus, Heraclitus, and the *περὶ ἀρχαίης ἱγτρικῆς* of Hippocrates. *b*) On Thucyd.: emendation and discussion of III 22, 3; 39, 4; 39, 8; 42, 5; 44, 1; 65, 3; 67, 7; 82, 8; I 76, 2; VI 38, 4. Most of these emendations commend themselves.

12. pp. 93-96. Three passages of Ennius (By L. Havet). Emendations of I 34 Vahlen (Cic. de Divin. I 20, 40); VII 10 Vahlen (A. Gell. XII 4); XII 1 Vahlen (Priscian, V 3, 17 and VI 7, 40).

13. pp. 97-143. New researches in Stichometry (By Ch. Graux). This is a very elaborate article. *a*) The author shows that stichometry was not

confined to the Alexandrians, and that the *στίχος* in prose was a fixed quantity, having been originally determined, in all probability, by the length of a Homeric line. He gives a table, extending through 13 pp., containing the number of *στίχοι* reported in ancient MSS. for Herodotus, Thucydides, Isocrates, Demosthenes, the Old and New Testaments, Eusebius, St. Gregory and Euthalius, with the sources from which the numbers were taken, and the value of the *στίχοι* in letters, determined by estimating the number of letters and dividing by the number of *στίχοι*. (They all fall between 34 and 38 letters. The Homeric verse averages about 37.) The table is accompanied by notes of great value. *b*) There was no relation between measurement by *στίχοι*, and the division "per cola et commata" employed in certain MSS. of Demosthenes, Cicero, and the Bible. This point is elaborately discussed and fully established. *c*) The numeration of the *στίχοι*, or lines, was of service in making reference to books which had the numbers at intervals on the margin, and especially in determining the pay of copyists. An edict of Diocletian (A. D. 301) *de pretiis rerum venalium*, fixed the pay of scribes at so much *per hundred lines*, which would have been perfectly idle, had not the *line* been a fixed quantity. Of course it was not necessary to make the actual lines of the same length as the normal *στίχος*. The number for each work was already known. For new works it is to be supposed that a MS. was written with uniform pages and the number of *στίχοι* determined by partial counting and computation. The *πίνακες* (catalogues) of the great Alexandrian libraries, prepared by Callimachus (about the middle of the third century) indicated the number of *στίχοι* for each work. The publishing of these catalogues, instead of spreading the custom of indicating the size of works in *στίχοι*, did much to put an end to it, by rendering it unnecessary.

14. p. 143. Note (by Γ) pronouncing a certain inscription of two words (published as "ancient" by the Ἀθήναιον, VI 4) to be at most 400 years, and at least three *months* old.

15. pp. 144-175. Journey of Horace to Brundisium (By E. Desjardins). The author modifies some views expressed in his *Voyage d'Horace à Brindes*, published in 1855. This article gives the results of a careful study of the entire route, describing cities, scenery, etc., as they were seen by Horace. A map specially prepared for the purpose accompanies the article. Some light is thrown upon a few passages, as vv. 25-6. The immortal Aufidius Luscus, "praetor" of Fundi, was really no praetor at all (as is clearly shown by inscriptions), but was *aedilis iuridicundo*; but his functions were similar to those of praetor in the city, and his title was rather cumbersome for verse, and then some humor or sarcasm is felt in the lofty title of praetor. The name of the *oppidulum* "quod versu dicere non est," was probably *Asculum Apulum*, and not *Equus Tuticus*, as some suppose, for this was off the route. "Asculum" could be put into a hexameter, but only by means of an undesirable elision. A modern commentator [who? H.] thinks the difficulty was that Horace was too modest to write the last two syllables of the name!¹ At verses 82-85 he could have written them without blushing seriously. The interview between Antonius

¹ As if the difference of quantity did not sufficiently mark the kind of termination and prevent a κακὲμφατον! Quod si recipias: nihil loqui tutum est, Quint. VIII 3, 47.—B. L. G.

and Octavius did not take place at Brundisium, as was expected, but at Tarentum.

16. p. 175. Two brief Notes. *a*) In Justin, VII 3, 4, "Adhibitis in convivium suum filiis et uxoris," H. W. changes *suum filiis* into *concubinis* to suit Herod., VII 18, καὶ τὰς παλλακὰς καὶ τὰς κουριδίας γυναῖκας. *b*) E. T. emends Steph. Byzant. sub voc. Ἀσσιγδα.

17. p. 176. On Claudian, Epigr. 2 (By Max Bonnet). Place vv. 15-18 between 4 and 5.

18. p. 176. In Aesch. Prom., 43, ἄκος γὰρ οὐδὲν τὸν δὲ θρηνεῖσθαι, Éd. Tournier proposes τῶδε.

19. pp. 177-187. Some remarks on the officers called *Praefecti* during the last period of the Roman Republic (By J. N. Madvig). These were at first *praefecti sociorum* (*socium*), who commanded a number of cohorts, each cohort being under a native officer of the allies. Their command not being a fixed and permanent one, various duties were assigned to them, such as commanding garrisons, forts, etc. The governors sent out to provinces took praefects with them; and if no war arose the office was a sinecure. When all the Italians became Roman citizens, there would have been no *raison d'être* for praefects, had not their functions been thus already extended; but now they were called simply "praefecti." The praefects of Caesar in Gaul were purely military officers, usually young and inexperienced in war, and commanded Gallic cavalry, etc., but those of the other provinces had nothing to do; and they could even remain at home, but be regarded as *absentes rei publicae causa*, which exempted them from all civil duties; and as those of *iudex* were onerous and otherwise unpleasant, the *praefectura* was a much sought office. With this light we can restore Cic. ad Att. V, 7: Sed tamen ut mandatum scias me curasse, quot ante ait Pompejus quinos praefectos delaturum novos vacationes iudiciariam causam." Read: *vacationis iudiciariae causa*. The nomination expressed by *deferre* here was merely intended to excuse from judiciary service. Hence, in Cic. ad Att. V 11: "nunc redeo ad quae mihi mandas: in praefectis excusatio iis quos voles deferto," read *excusandis* instead of *excusatio iis*. This *deferre* was really *deferre ad aerarium*, that being the place where such lists were received and filed (i. e., hung up). Many proofs of this are given by the author.

Post scriptum. Cic. ad Att. II 14, says: "basilicam habeo, non villam, frequentia Formianorum," which is followed in the modern editions by "at quam parem basilicae tribum Aemilium!" But *parem* here is a conjecture of S. Dubois, the MSS. giving *partem*. We should read: "at quam partem basilicae? Tribum Aemilium!" (i. e., the most crowded and turbulent part).

20. p. 187. Emendatiuncula. Éd. Tournier proposes *ῆ'* for *ῆ* or *ῆ* in Od. XI 172. [This would remove many other instances of hiatus in Homer.]

21. pp. 188-194. De fragmentis quibusdam Historicorum in Codice Athoo repertis (By C. G. Cobet). Discussion and emendation of about thirty passages of Dexippus, Priscus, Eusebius and Aristodemus.

22. p. 194. Emendation of Herod. I 37 (by Éd. T.), and of a frag. of Ennius (by λ.), and of a passage of Philoxenus (by T.).

23. pp. 195-203. Observationes criticae (By H. van Herwerden). Emendations of fourteen passages in Hom. Il., fourteen in Od., five in Hymns and twenty-four in Xen. Cyropaed. These corrections deserve careful attention.

24. pp. 204-214. Observations on Hor., Book I, Odes 1, 3, 12, 20 (By Gaston Boissier). Opposes the arbitrary method of Peerlkamp and his imitators. Defends the authenticity of the first two and last two verses of Ode 1, of *trahuntque siccas machinae carinas* in Ode 3, of the disputed verses in Ode 12 and of the whole of Ode 20.

25. p. 214. Emendatiuncula (By Éd. Tournier). Soph. Antig. 124-5: put τοῖος—*Ἀρεος in parenthesis without pause before or after it.

26. pp. 215-218. New information concerning three Greek-writers (By P. Foucart). *a* Polemon the Periegete, son of *Milesios* (and not of Euegetes, as Suidas says), was made *πρόξενος* at Delphi. *b*) Hegesianax of Alexandria in the Troad, son of *Diogenes*, made *πρόξενος* at Delphi. *c*) Philip, son of Aristides, of Pergamus. An inscription (published in the *Παλιγγενεσία*, July 18, 1874) on the base of a statue erected to his honor at Epidaurus, contains: *a*) a dedication in two elegiac distichs, in the Doric dialect, and *b*) a dozen lines of the Introduction to a History written by him, in the Ionic dialect. But for this inscription we should not have known of his existence. The indications are that the inscription and its subject belong to the end of the third century B. C.

27. pp. 218-237. Supplement to the Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum (By Ch. Graux). The MS. Σ-I-20 of the Escorial contains 1600 articles, each being composed of a proverb accompanied by explanations. Graux discusses the MS. and gives ninety-four articles, containing: *a*) variations useful in establishing the correct reading, and *b*) proverbs, or explanations of proverbs, partly or entirely new. Important critical notes are added.

28. pp. 238-240. On the date of the *Dictys* of Septimius (By L. Havet). Brief history of this hoax, with discussion of the views of different scholars. The appellation of *consularis* instead of *proconsul* given to Rutilius Rufus in the work places it after A. D. 350. A not very definite posterior limit is fixed by the fact that Syrianus of Alexandria cites the work in his commentary on the Rhetoric of Hermogenes (A. D. 400 or later).

29. p. 240. On Hor. Od. III 23, 16-20 (By Walz). The *condition* lies in *immunis* (innocent), and *non sumptuosa* must be taken together as a single idea, *inexpensive* (a *sumptuosa hostia* would be a self-contradiction, *hostia* denoting an insignificant offering), and construed as *means* by which the hand is made *blandior* (agreeable to the Penates).

REVUE DE PHILOGIE. Vol. III. 1879.

1. pp. 1-13. Studies on Demosthenes. The Olynthian and Euboean Wars (By Henri Weil). Discussion of the question: In what year occurred the second of the four campaigns of the Athenians in Euboea? Diodorus does not mention it; Plutarch confounds it with another campaign. Demosthenes mentions it several times in the Contra Midiam, and at § 191 we learn that a part of the knights who served in Euboea were transported to Olynthus. But Dion. Hal. seems to place the battle of Tamynae two years *before* the date of the Olynthian war as given by Philochorus. The rest of this article is devoted chiefly to reconciling the statements of Dion. Hal. and Philochorus, which is accomplished by amending Dionysius and putting *Θουδήμων* and *not* *Θέελον* in a lacuna in C. I. A. 2, 105.

2. p. 13. Palaeographic note (By T.). At the end of the Oration against Philip's Letter in MS. F. of Demosthenes, read *Διὸρθῶται ἀπὸ δῆο Ἀττικανῶν* and not *Διὸρθῶται ἀνὰ δῆο Ἀττικανὰ* as Voemel writes it. In the MS. it is *Αττικῶ* with contraction mark after *κ*. But *ω* above the line stands for *ων* as often as for *ως*, a fact not stated in works on Palaeography. So *ο=ον* in certain MSS.; instances of *α, ε, η, υ=ας, εν, ες, ης, υν*, which are rare.

3. pp. 14-15. Apropos of a verse of Juvenal (VII 104) (By Gaston Boissier). *Quis dabit historico quantum daret acta legenti?* The *acta* were not necessarily official proceedings (cf. Cic. ad Fam. II 15, with ibid. VIII 7), but included private transactions and even rumors and gossip. The *acta legentes* were those who composed the journals containing these *acta*. Hence: "Who will pay a historian as much as he would pay a reporter?"

4. p. 15. Note on Xen. Cyropaed. VIII 1, 20, and Procopius, Gothic War, I 14 (By X.).

5. pp. 16-18. Note on a MS. of the library of Schlestadt (By A. Giry). This MS. (No. 1153 *bis*), which has never been collated, contains: *a*) A collection of recipes and directions with regard to arts and measurements, mostly of the middle ages, but partly dating from the late Roman empire. The most important, entitled *ΣΥΜΕΤΡΙΑ ΑΝΘΡΩΠΟΥ* (*sic*), gives a passage of Vitruvius, and is followed by some pen sketches of capitals, bases, entablatures, volutes, etc. *b*) The six books of Vitruvius, well worth examining. *c*) An abridgment of Vitruvius by M. Cetus (or Cetius) Faventinus. *d*) Further recipes, etc., which are found also in the *Cod. Leidensis*, etc.

6. pp. 19-25. On the meaning of the exclamation *malum!* (By Constant Martha.) The definitions in the Dictionaries are all wrong. "Malum!" is applied only to *folly*, of whatever degree, from ordinary ineptitude up to downright madness. The author enumerates all the known examples, showing that such is its use in each instance. In the more serious authors, orators and philosophers, the expression is always immediately followed by *amentia, dementia*, or something signifying folly or madness, with one exception, where the sentence is addressed to a prince; and in all writers, though the feeling of the speaker may be anger, disgust, etc., still the *cause* of the feeling is always folly of some sort, in word or deed; and the sentence is always interrogative. The origin is discussed: probably a superstitious deprecation. [Could it originally have been *Di malum avertant*, the *malum=dementia*? The author makes no attempt to translate it into French; but the English "in the name of common sense" seems to be its exact equivalent.]

7. pp. 26-27. On Catullus (By E. Benoist). *a*) LV 20:

Quos cunctos mihi, Cameri, dicares.

Some read *iunctos*; but the true reading, *vinctos*, is established from MSS. (cf. Hom. Od. V, 17-26). *b*) XXII 7-9. All the MSS. give *membrane*, all the editions *membrana*. We should read thus:

Novi umbilici, lora rubra, membranae,
Derecta plumbo et pumice omnia aequata.

Membranae denotes the cover, and it was the lines on the pages that were *derecta plumbo* and *aequata*.

8. pp. 28-31. Certain passages of Iph. Taur. (By Éd. Tournier). Twenty-one conjectures, and rejection of two passages (958-960 and 1455-1457).

9. p. 32. On a new Frag. of Aeschylus (By H. W.). Found by Wilamowitz-Moellendorff in the Cod. Marcianus 423 of the Scholia of Aristides. H. W. proposes some emendations.

10. pp. 33-63. The cult of the *Divi* and the cult of Rome and Augustus (By E. Desjardins). The author sums up the results of this elaborate investigation under five heads: *a*) The cult of emperors and members of the imperial family, *Divi* and *Divae*, had Rome for its centre. They were all honored together in the college of the *Sodales Augustales*, and each individually by *flamines* who bore the names of *flamen Divi Augusti*, *Divi Claudii*, etc. *b*) This last cult, prevalent in the cities of Italy, and in Narbonne, was less common in other provinces, and very rare in Africa; and in Spain alone this cult and that of Rome and Augustus, without being associated, were in the hands of the same *flamines*. *c*) The political cult of Rome and Augustus (two divinities combined into one—the Genius of the Roman People) dates back to the year 29, and was established by Augustus in honor of Rome and Caesar, and was spread through all the provinces, where it flourished for three centuries. This cult, though at first *imposed*, was afterward adopted with readiness by the natives and non-citizens, who alone were called by the Senate and Emperors to the priesthood of this universal religion, which was essentially Roman through the object of worship, and essentially native through the exclusive choice of priests who were strangers, in origin at least, to the Roman citizenship. *d*) For three centuries this cult was of two sorts, *provincial* and *municipal*: provincial, with a *concilium* composed of *legati* of each of the cities of the province, electing a *flamen* and a *sacerdos Romae et Augusti*; municipal with a *flamen Augusti*, elected by the *ordo decurionum*, generally called *perpetuus*, although his active functions were annual. *e*) From the beginning of the fourth century the *sacerdotes* and *flamines* of the provinces and cities, representing henceforth another thing, continued, though Christianity was established, the former called *sacerdotes*, and the latter *flamines perpetui*, representing the pagan and Christian aristocracy of the cities, and to this last category belong the thirty-six *flamines* of the *Ordo of Thamugas* (discussed in the earlier part of the article).

It is worthy of note that in some instances baptized Christians, as Constantine the Great, received the apotheosis.

11. p. 64. On Sidonius Apollinaris (By É. Chatelain). *a*) Carm. 9, 296: "In castris hederæ ter aureatus" is a conjecture, the MSS. giving *ter laureatus*, which the metre forbids. Read *hederate, laureatus*. (For the vocative, see Carm. 23, 67). *b*) Carm. 11, 56: "Cujus fax, arcus, corytus pendebat at ille": remove false quantity in *corytus* by writing *pendet*.

12. pp. 65-67. A passage of the Georgics (By O. Nigoles). In Georg. I, 221-222:

Ante tibi Eoae Atlantides abscondantur,
Gnosiaque ardentis decedat stella coronae,

Vergil designates the morning setting of the Pleiades and the heliac setting of Corona Borealis. The former occurred (popularly speaking) in the last days of October and the first of November. The other should have occurred, according to this passage, about the same time. It has been supposed that

in this passage Vergil made a mistake, and that he should have said the *rising* and not the setting of the Crown. The argument is this: The heliac rising of the Crown occurred (according to Pliny and others (!)) at the first of October; the heliac setting always occurs earlier than the heliac rising; therefore the heliac setting must have occurred before the month of October. The major premiss is true of constellations south of the ecliptic, but for those north of it, like the Crown, the very converse is true; that is, the heliac rising precedes the heliac setting. [The demonstration given by the author is hardly necessary, as any one who is at all acquainted with the apparent motion of the heavenly bodies can see the truth of the proposition at once, when his attention is called to it.] Nor is there any need of *authorities*. The heliac setting of the Crown in the lat. of Rome takes place at the middle of December, which is (because of the precession of the equinoxes) twenty-seven days later than its occurrence in the days of Vergil. Of course the popular notion of heliac rising and setting allowed a broad margin.

13. pp. 68-78. *Homerica* (By H. van Herwerden). Discussion (with emendations) of thirteen passages of the *Iliad*, six of the *Odyssey*, and two of the *Hymns*.

14. p. 78. *Emendatiuncula* (By É. T.). a) *Aesch. Pers.* 284: read στενώ for στένω, b) *Herod. I* 132: for . . . κρέα. Διαθέντος read . . . κρεάδια. Θέντος . . . c) *Eurip. Herc. Fur.* 1251, τσαῦτα replies to πολλὰ of preceding verse. Change οἰκον into οἰκόν.

15. pp. 79-90. *Miscellaneous criticisms* (By L. Havet). I. On an Oration of Cato. A frag. of his *Origines* quoted by Fronto, containing a quotation from Cato's *De Sumptu suo*, which in its turn quotes briefly from his *Sponsio*. By printing the different parts in different type, the whole frag. is rendered (for the first time?) intelligible. II. On the *Medea* and the *Andromache* of Ennius. Three passages elucidated or emended. III. An old enigma in Varro, cited by Aulus Gellius (XII, 6) in three senarii. Objections to Bart's restoration. Read, with slight change of MS.:

Semel minusne, an bis minu'? Non sit sat. Scio:
Vtrumque eorum. Vt quondam audiui dicier
Ioui ipsi regi noluit concedere.

The word is *terminus*. IV. On the prefaces of the *Dictys* of Septimius (7 pp.). There are two prefaces to this work: one, a *letter* to Q. Aradius Rufus, the other, a *prologue*. It is shown almost to absolute demonstration, that the work was published three times. At the second publication, the sixth Book was added, and the letter served as a preface to this Book alone. The third time (hoping to suppress the letter entirely) the author prefixed the prologue to the entire work, explaining difficulties more fully to the suspicious, and even contradicting the letter in some particulars. But some copyist in the course of time found the letter and added it on the blank space before the prologue. Hence, some MSS. have it, and some have not. If this theory is true, it will be found that all the MSS. which contain the letter belong to the same family—a point not yet examined. V. *Diploma pedestre*. In an inscription near Carthage occurs this verse (!): *Diploma circaui totam regione pedestrem*, where *regione* is *acc.* and *pedestrem* is *abl.*, agreeing with *Diploma* (1st Dec.)!

The author pronounced -e and -em alike, and failed to discriminate properly in writing. VI. *Aegritudo Perdicae*, V 174: read *cetera dicat*.

16. pp. 91–151. Philo Byzantinus. Fortifications (By A. de Rochas and Ch. Graux). [The following is Graux's own summary of this elaborate article.] 1) Preliminary notice, containing *a*) the biography of this engineer (second century B. C.); *b*) an examination of what is left us of his *Μηχανικὴ σύνταξις*, whether in the original text, or under the form of a summary in Greek, or in Latin translation made from the Arabic, with indication of the editions, translations, and works relating to the author, and a review of what is known of the lost portions, with an attempt at a partial restitution of the order in which the different books of this great work succeeded each other; *c*) the classification of twenty-nine MSS. of Book IV and of the so-called Book V, which are traced back to three MSS. of the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries, and the determination of the relation between the only edition of the so-called Book V, and the MSS.; *d*) examples, *a*) of improvements of the text suggested by the new basis of criticism, and *β*) of conjectures proposed in certain cases where the testimony of the MSS. agrees; *e*) the plan followed in the publication; *f*) invitation of the attention of philologists to this important text, which is in a bad condition. 2) Text of Philo from p. 79 to p. 86 of the *Veteres Mathematici*, with *apparatus criticus* intended to be complete, French translation opposite the text, and exegetical notes with five cuts. Among these notes are some technical observations on cements (γύψος), κλίνη (unity of rectangular surface), the ἐλέπολις of Deme-trius Poliorcetes, the dimensions and range of the ταλαντιαῖος πετροβόλος, etc.; lexicographical notes on γύψος (sometimes *lime*), μηχανήμα (a tower of wooden frame-work), πετροβόλοι, λιθοβόλοι, καταπάλται, ὀξυβαλεῖς (denoting sometimes machines, and sometimes the projectiles hurled by them), βέλη (also with double meaning), ἀμφίπλευρος, ὀρθιος, ἐφίξις, τειχοποιία and πυργοποιία, δίοδος and πάροδος, βελόστασις (place prepared for a machine), ἐπεξέρχεσθαι, βάρη (πίργοι βαρεῖς), ἐπάλξεις, ἐπάλξιον, θυρίδες and προμαχώνες, ἐμβολεύς (ξύλινος), ὑπορύττειν and διορύττειν, δόκιδες (χελώνη ὀρυκτρὶς), στοαί, ἀμφίβολος, etc. In the preliminary notice and the exegetical notes, various conjectures on Athenaeus Mathematicus and Diodorus Siculus; also on Hero Alexandrinus (Belop. 10), Plutarch (Demetr. 21, 1), Josephus (War V 4, 3), Polyaeus (VII 9), Athenaeus (XIII p. 538, B), etc. [This work contains much valuable information and must have required immense labor.]

17. pp. 152–153. Varia (By P. Thomas). I. On the Hortensius of Cicero. New proofs that this work had ceased to exist in the middle ages. II. Manilius, Astron. V 322–323: for *suadetque* read *gaudetque*. III. Ter. Heaut. v. 1017–1020: omit what comes between *Id quod* and *tui similis est probe*.

18. pp. 154–160. Observations on the text of Sidonius Apollinaris (By É. Chatelain). The author, having examined all the editions and classified the MSS., gives *a*) twelve corrections after all the MSS., and *b*) thirteen corrections after one or more MSS.

19. p. 160. Priscian I 9, 52 (By L. Havet). Instead of "*austrum pro ostrum*" (where o is short), read "*austium pro ostium*."

20. The Revue des Revues for 1878 and 1879 contains abstracts of many periodicals not reviewed in 1877, and more countries are represented.

M. W. HUMPHREYS.

ANGLIA. Zeitschrift für englische Philologie. Herausgegeben von R. P. WÜLCKER und M. TRAUTMANN. I Band. Halle, 1878.¹

The Prospectus prefixed to the first volume of the *Anglia* informs us that in the last decade, especially since the establishment of chairs for English in the universities, the study of English has greatly increased in Germany, and as the *Jahrbuch für romanische und englische sprache und literatur* had ceased to appear, it was thought that this branch of philology was strong enough to have a journal of its own; hence the foundation of the *Anglia*, the first part of which, edited by Prof. R. P. Wülcker, of Leipzig, contains essays in the whole field of the English language and literature, from the seventh century to the present, not excluding the dialects; also texts not yet edited or not easily accessible, if not too lengthy, and collations of valuable works. The second part, edited by Dr. M. Trautmann, Privat-Docent at Leipzig, contains criticisms of all new publications relating to English philology, and at the close of each year a bibliography of the preceding year. Each volume consists of three numbers, which appear at intervals during the year, and two complete volumes have so far appeared. A summary of the contents of the first volume will be given in the present paper, and these summaries will be continued from time to time.

I. The first number opens with The last published essay of the lamented Anglo-Saxon scholar, C. W. M. Grein, who died June 15, 1877. This is a paper entitled *Ist die bezeichnung "angelsaechsische sprache" wirklich unberechtigt?* Grein cites passages from Kemble's *Codex Diplomaticus Aevi Saxonici*, containing titles of kings, from Alfred to Edward the Confessor, in which the terms, *Angulsaxonum*, *Angulsaxna*, and their variations occur forty-four times, and in some passages *Anglo-Saxons* are distinguished from *Northumbrians*, whence Grein concludes that we are justified in using the term *Anglo-Saxon* speech in distinction from the later language, and from the language spoken north of the Humber. Wülcker refers in a note to the well-known essay of Freeman, in the appendix to the first volume of his *History of the Norman Conquest*, and to an article by Prof. Lounsbury, in the *New Englander* for January, 1876, combatting Freeman.

J. Zupitza follows with The text of the *Poema Morale*, after MS. D., which MS. has been heretofore known only from extracts in Hickes' *Thesaurus*, a comparison of the six MSS. with each other to determine their relations, and a discussion of the age of the poem, which Zupitza assigns to about 1170, as against Dr. R. Morris, who thinks it "probable that all the numerous versions of the *Moral Ode* are transcribed from some late tenth or early eleventh-century version."

R. Köhler finds A story similar to Chaucer's *Miller's Tale* in Valentin Schumann's *Nachtbüchlein*, published in 1559. He thinks Schumann could not have derived his story from Chaucer, but they must have had a common original. A part of the story is found also in the *Novellino* of Maſuccio of Salerno, who lived in the second half of the fifteenth century, as stated by

¹In the case of the *Anglia*, and in a few other periodicals of recent establishment, it has been thought best to begin the summary with the beginning for the sake of completeness.—ED.

Hippisley, Chapters on Early English Literature, London, 1837, on the authority of The British Bibliographer, by Brydges, London, 1810-14. This fact had eluded the vigilance of Tyrwhitt.

H. Düntzer discusses Two essays on Marlowe's Faust, in the Jahrbuch für romanische und englische literatur, one by Schmid on the relation of Marlowe's play to the German and to the English Faustbook; the other by Albers on later additions to the play. Düntzer finds that Marlowe used the English Faustbook translated from the German edition of 1588. He also cites certain passages supposed to be added by a later hand.

C. Horstmann gives in full The texts of the Legends of Celestinus and Susanna, and comments at length on each. The MS. of the Celestinus is of the fifteenth century, but the poem is more than a century older than the MS. It is in the East-Midland dialect, though not pure, for it betrays peculiarities of the copyist. After examining with true German thoroughness the language and the rime, Horstmann concludes that the poem is one of the older productions of Old English literature, and probably has the same author as the Gregorius. It belongs to the same dialect and period with Havelok, Gregorius, and the Song of Alexius. Alliteration is seldom met with, and the metre has not yet been found in any other legend.¹ The Susanna shows such a mixture of Northern, Midland and Southern forms that it is difficult to determine the original dialect, but it must have been the Northern. Its complete rhythm and metre, rime and alliteration, make it probable that it was intended for singing; the melody follows almost of itself. Dr. Morris assigns this poem to the author of Sir Gawayne, about 1360, and calls the dialect "West-Midland," but Horstmann thinks it belongs much further north.

W. Sattler contributes a Series of examples illustrating the use of prepositions in modern English, and—I, *to expect from* and *to expect of*. He lays down canons, some of which can scarcely be sustained, but we have not space to go into an examination of them. His "numerous examples" are undoubtedly "welcome," but to the deductions from them we might take exception, for in good modern English usage it is often immaterial whether we use *from* or *of* after *expect*, and the distinctions drawn are sometimes rather fine spun. A thorough familiarity with the modern spoken language is necessary for such generalizations.

M. Trautmann follows with a very full and thorough article on the poet Huchown and his works. He cites the passage from Wyntown's Chronicle of Scotland, referring to Huchown, and the opinions of Chalmers, Laing, Sir Frederic Madden, Dr. Richard Morris, Panton, and Donaldson, with respect to his works. Trautmann subjects the nine poems sometimes attributed to Huchown to a careful examination, linguistic and metrical, and finds that four poems, Gawayn and the Grene Knyght, The Pearl, Cleanness, and Patience, are from the same author; the Morte Arthure is not by the author of these, nor is the Troy Book, and these two are by different authors; Golagros and Gawane is by a different author still, and so is the Anturs of Arther at the Tarnewathelan; but finally, the Susanna must have been written by the same author as the Morte Arthure. The next section goes to prove that this writer was the real Huchown, and the last section that Wyntown's Huchown and Sir Hugh of Eglintoun, mentioned by Dunbar, were one and the same person, who "flourished about

¹ See, however, III following.

the middle of the fourteenth century," in Scotland, as suggested by Chalmers.

The first part of this number concludes with a Collation of the Poetical Salomon and Saturn with the MS., by H. Sweet. Kemble's text was used in this collation, and Sweet finds many corrections necessary. "The majority of the spellings altered by Kemble are good Early West-Saxonisms, and two passages unintelligible in Kemble's and Grein's texts are now made perfectly clear by reference to the MS."

The second part contains Notices, by F. A. Leo, of Karl Elze's Shakespeare Halle, 1876, and of von Friesen's pamphlet, Dr. Karl Elze's William Shakespeare, Leipzig, 1876, in which von Friesen defends Shakespeare against the suspicion that he is "no good Christian," and contends against the designation "humanist;" but, says Leo, "dem humanisten Elze ist er der humanist, dem gläubigen christen Friesen der gläubige christ. Und so möge es bleiben, so lange Shakespeare bleibt, denn: 'liest doch nur jeder aus dem buch sich heraus'." There follows a review, by W. Wagner, of Ward's History of English Dramatic Literature to the Death of Queen Anne, London, 1875, and one by R. Wülcker of Arnold's Beowulf, London, 1876. The tenor of Wülcker's review may be gathered from the following judgment, which he undertakes to establish, and which, we must confess, is but too well founded: "Durch Arnold's werk ist die angelsächsische philologie auch um keinen schritt weiter gebracht worden; im gegentheil bekundet sich darin an vielen stellen ein offener rückschritt gegen die einzelausgabe Beowulfs durch Grein und die von Heyne." Most of Wülcker's article is occupied with a criticism of Arnold's Introduction, in which he takes exception to Arnold's description of the MS., his deficient bibliography, his arguments for the date and origin of the Beowulf, especially to the slight grounds adduced for assigning it to the same period with the Guthlac, and to the hypothesis, "original" with Arnold, of the way in which the materials for the poem came to England. As to the "*liedertheorie*," Arnold confounds author and copyist, and dismisses the subject too hastily. Wülcker adds some remarks on the omission in the MS. of the numbers for Cantos XXIX and XXX, a small matter, in our opinion; some of his criticisms of Arnold, while in the main just, have reference to *kleinigkeiten*, and the whole tone is very depreciatory. In regard to most of Arnold's notes Wülcker is very right in saying that one who does not know his forms "mache sich überhaupt noch nicht an die lektüre Beowulfs." He concludes with criticisms of some of Arnold's remarks, chiefly of value for the rendering of v. 169 et seqq., which turns on the sense given to *gifstol*, which means *the hall Heorot*, according to Wülcker, and not simply *the throne* therein. The passage cited from Orosius in illustration of v. 69 et seqq., does not seem to us to the point. Wülcker is also right, finally, in charging Arnold with a failure to make use of the single editions of Grein and Heyne, the two latest and best German editions, and one who will make an edition of Beowulf cannot afford to disregard them. We cannot now go into the subject of Beowulf criticism, though we hope to return to it hereafter, but suffice it to say that we have carefully collated every line of Grein's text (1867) with the editions of Kemble, Thorpe, Arnold, and Heyne (1873), and we think it manifest that Arnold's text is printed from Thorpe's with some changes to correspond to Grein's text in the Bibliothek

der A. S. Poesie (1857). When we get the fac-simile of the MS., soon to be published by the Early English Text Society under the editorial supervision of Prof. Zupitza, of Berlin, we shall be in a better position to make an edition of Beowulf, and such an one as college and university students need, with critical and explanatory notes and glossary, and without translation, after the example of the editions of Grein and Heyne already referred to, which, for students of German, will answer all purposes. Some passages, doubtless, will always remain dark, for we have not the means for their elucidation; all we can do is to take the best conjecture accessible and make the most of it.

II. In the second number J. Zupitza gives the Texts of one English [Anglo-Saxon] and two Latin bee-spells, and goes into a criticism of text and translation of the former, which had been misunderstood except by Cockayne in his *Leechdoms, Wortcunning, and Starcraft of Early England*, I 384 (1864), Kemble and Rieger having referred the word *sigewif* to the *waelyrian*, and Ten Brink having followed them; J. Grimm did not so do, but failed to give explanation or translation, his text being corrupt. Zupitza gives also a short fragment of an English Chronicle of the years 1113 and 1114 (Cott. Dom. A. IX), which had escaped the notice of the editors of the Anglo-Saxon Chronicle.

K. Regel follows with an extended article on *Spruch und Bild im Layamon*. We would remark, by the way, that Rieger's first sentence consists of twenty-three lines and his second of sixteen, the two comprising one large octavo page. Barring this characteristically German style, the article is a very full and thorough comparison of Layamon's *Brut* with Wace's *Brut* and Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regum Britanniae*, showing the dependence, and still more the independence, of Layamon in respect to his use of proverbs and metaphors. Want of space will not permit us to specify, but Regel's conclusion is fully justified that Layamon is not only "in überwiegendem Masse" independent of Geoffrey and Wace, but exhibits such creative power that he appears as an unusually gifted poet.

C. S. Weiser investigates Pope's influence on Byron's youthful poems. Of modern poets Byron imitated, says Weiser, Shakespeare, Moore, and Pope; the first least of all, for Byron had no dramatic talent; the second chiefly in his lyrical poems; but Pope's influence reigned not only in his poetry, but in his thoughts and feelings. Weiser traces this influence in the *Hints from Horace* *Curse of Minerva*, and *Hours of Idleness* chiefly, and, as regards form and rime, in *English Bards and Scotch Reviewers* and the *Waltz*. He next examines Pope's influence on the metre and rime of each of these poems, and concludes with citations from Byron's letters, showing his high opinion of Pope, thus justifying the assertion that Pope's influence on Byron's earlier poems was greater than that of any other poet.

W. Sattler continues his *Examples of the use of prepositions in modern English* with—II, *a visit to*, and—III, *welcome to*. The remarks on the examples show, as it seems to us, rather a book-knowledge of the language than a practical acquaintance with it. Note Anm. I, p. 281, and Anm. 2, p. 285.

J. Zupitza contributes three Latin-English Proverbs, i. e. Anglo-Saxon—for in Zupitza's usage the term "English" covers anything from Caedmon down—and the Nicene Creed in an English copy of the twelfth century.

C. Horstmann follows with another of his valuable contributions, and this time the full Text of the *Canticum de Creatione*, an early English poem of 1200 lines, written, as we learn from the poem itself, in 1375, and from its mixture of Southern and Midland forms leading to the conclusion that it belongs to a locality where these dialects were in contact, and that at that period the fusion had already begun which resulted in the formation of a common literary language. Horstmann gives here, as before, a careful analysis of the language of the poem and a summary of its contents.

A. Holder furnishes Collations to Anglo-Saxon works, and—I, the variations of two Cottonian MSS. of an A. S. treatise, *De rebus in Oriente mirabilibus*, printed for the first time by Cockayne in his *Narratiunculæ anglice conscriptæ*, London, 1861.

K. Elze supplies Notes and conjectures to modern English poets, being comments on certain passages from Shakespeare, Fletcher, Marlowe, and Milton (Tem., M. of V. (2); J. C. (3); T. N. K., Ed. II, and P. L.).

The first part of this number concludes with an appreciative obituary notice of Grein, by R. Wülcker, containing a few biographical details and a list of Grein's works. Wülcker says: "Durch seine textausgabe der angelsächsischen poesie wurde überhaupt erst ein studium des Angelsächsischen, und damit der entwicklung der englischen sprache in Deutschland möglich. Sein glossar ist ein werk von solchem fleisse und solcher gründlichkeit, dass wir deutsche stolz darauf sein können." Others besides Germans may be permitted to be proud of Grein's services to Anglo-Saxon philology and to concur heartily in the following eulogy: "Stets wird uns Deutschen Grein's werk der grund bleiben, auf welchem wir weiter bauen, und stets werden billig denkende forschler, auch wenn sie weit vorangeschritten sind, des mannes in liebe und verehrung gedenken, welcher unter ungünstigen äussern verhältnissen mit grösster selbstverleugnung, mit einem fleisse, welcher auch nicht durch schwere krankheit gebrochen werden konnte, uns den weg gewiesen hat und die bahn geebnet, auf welcher wir nur weiter gehen können, und, wo in zukunft das studium des Englischen blüht in Deutschland, England und Amerika, wird Grein's name nicht vergessen sein."

In the book notices, W. Wagner concludes his review of Ward's *History of English Dramatic Literature*.

Dr. D. Asher notices J. Schumann's *See und seefahrt nebst dem metaphorischen gebrauch dieser begriffe in Shakespeare's dramen*.

R. Wülcker criticises Kölbing's *Englische Studien*, I bd., 1 heft. Heilbronn, 1877. We must repeat a remark, heretofore made, that this criticism is very depreciatory in its tone and rests in great part on small matters. It naturally led to a reply from Kölbing, and to this a rejoinder from Wülcker is prefixed to *Anglia* II band, 2 und 3 heft, so that we have the editors of two German periodicals devoted to the same object at loggerheads with each other, which cannot advance the cause of English philology. Kölbing's *Englische Studien*, like the *Anglia*, is intended to supply in part the discontinued *Jahrbuch für romanische und englische literatur*, and it is a credit to German scholars that they can sustain so well two periodicals of such merit in this field. Professor Skeat has expressed the opinion (in a private letter) that no such journal could be sustained in England, and we in America

venture to claim only a small corner in the American Journal of Philology. It is to be hoped, then, that for the sake of scholars abroad, who will take no interest in such personalities, harmony may reign between the editors of these periodicals, both of which are of great value to our science.

The book notices close with one by M. Trautmann of Sweet's Anglo-Saxon Reader, Oxford, 1876, and his opinion is summed up by designating it "ein empfehlenswertes buch." After describing the arrangement of the book and giving its table of contents, Trautmann takes exception to some of Sweet's views as to Anglo-Saxon sounds. Sweet says: "*s* is always *sharp*," Trautmann, "only *sonant s* can interchange with *r*." Trautmann then goes into a very full and strictly logical argument to show that A. S. *ea*, *eo*, *ed* *eó*, both the so-called breakings and the diphthongs, also the ablant *eó*, which he still further distinguishes (designating these sounds as *ea*¹, *ea*², *eo*¹, *eo*², *eo*³), should *not* be accented, as usually, on the *second* vowel, but on the *first*, and therefore *ea*² and *eo*², *eo*³, should no longer be written *ed* and *eó*. Trautmann's views, though not original with him, are well sustained and seem to us convincing. We should be glad to hear from Mr. Sweet further on the subject, for he is our chief English authority in Anglo-Saxon phonology. Wülcker has evidently been convinced, for the Prospectus of his new edition of Grein's Bibliothek, states that the forms *æa*, *æo* will hereafter be used. Trautmann gives Sweet's arrangement of the declensions and conjugations, and says: Sweet's behandlung der declination und conjugation ist nicht so gelehrt wie z. b. die in F. A. March's angelsächsischer grammatik, aber sie ist unendlich viel übersichtlicher und praktischer. To this last statement we beg leave to take exception. We have been using March's A. S. Reader for several years in teaching, and we consider the arrangement of the declensions by stem-vowels (also adopted by Heyne and Koch) as easy to remember as that by plural endings and less cumbersome; and the same may be said for the arrangement of the conjugations as compared with Sweet's—only we should prefer a subdivision of the *first*, the *a*-conjugation, as is made by Heyne and Koch—while the advantage of having a concise and scientific view of the conjugations, and a means of comparing the Anglo-Saxon with the other Teutonic dialects, which is itself a *practical* advantage, vastly counterbalances any supposed ease in learning a less scientific arrangement. Sweet's Reader is undoubtedly a well-prepared and useful book, excepting some misprints, which it is hoped the new edition has corrected; it can safely be recommended to all students of Anglo-Saxon.

III. In the third number C. Horstmann supplies an addition to Celestinus, a so-called Song to our Lady, in the same metre with the Legend of Pope Celestinus, which is found in the Göttingen MS. of the Cursor Mundi, and is written in the Northern dialect.

J. Zupitza communicates the Contents of two MSS. of Middle-English Legends, not mentioned by Horstmann in his Altenglische Legenden, one from the Library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, the other from the Bodleian. The former is of the end of the fourteenth century, the latter, of the beginning of the fifteenth. Zupitza cautions his "jüngere fachgenossen" to let the Legends alone, as Horstmann's "great" edition for the E. E. T. S. will soon appear. We have already seen that Zupitza uses the term "English"

for Anglo-Saxon and for twelfth-century English; here he uses the expression, "Middle-English." It were much to be hoped that scholars would agree upon certain definite designations for the periods of English, and thus avoid the confusion of calling Anglo-Saxon merely "English" and the language of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries "Middle English." We shall not quarrel with any one for calling Anglo-Saxon "Old English," for so it is, but we should like to know definitely what stage of the language is under discussion. Zupitza, in remarks on Morris' *Old English Miscellany*, also gives the text of a poem in that collection, with the "nicht ganz passenden titel Long Life," from another MS. than the two used by Morris, and seeks to establish the relations between these MSS.

F. Rosenthal follows with a very full discussion of the alliterating English long-line in the fourteenth century. He uses eight poems in this investigation: Alisaunder, William of Palerne, Joseph of Arimathe, Piers the Plowman, Sir Gawain, Pierce the Ploughman's Crede, Richard the Redeles, and the Crowned King. After describing the editions of these poems, Rosenthal notes the rhythmical characteristics of the verse, and then treats at length the alliteration, coming to the conclusion that the licenses which seldom occurred in Anglo-Saxon had increased very much in the fourteenth century, and specially noticeable was the repetition of the alliterating letters. The article closes with a comparative table illustrating the use of alliteration in the three texts of Piers Plowman.

A. Brandl communicates a letter, now in the Zurich Library, dated April 30, 1725, of the Saxon Court-poet König to Bodmer, in which mention is made of the First German translation of Milton's *Paradise Lost*, that by Th. Haake, died 1690, which is now lost.

J. Zupitza furnishes fifty *Verbesserungen und Erklärungen* to the following works: Thorpe's *Apollonius* (9), Ettmüller's *A. S. Lexicon* (2), Skeat's *Havelok* (10), Lumby's *Floriz* (7), Chaucer's *Prologue* (7), Furnivall's *Arthur* (1), Peacock's *Myrc's Instructions* (3), and Wright's *Generydes* (11). Lack of space forbids comment, which some of these remarks invite.

R. P. Wülcker has a lengthy essay on the poet Cynewulf, chiefly devoted to controverting the views of Dietrich as to Cynewulf's origin and works. Wülcker gives a "romanhafte" life of Cynewulf after Dietrich's *Marburg Programs* with some additions from Grein and Rieger, and then discusses the four points: Cynewulf was a Northumbrian, was bishop of Lindisfarne 737-780, has some connection with the Ruthwell Cross, and wrote other works than the Riddles, Christ, Juliana, and Helena. He disposes very summarily of the views of Wright, Thorpe, and Kemble that he may have been the same person as Kenulfus, Abbot of Peterborough, about 992; and shows that Dietrich in his first *Program* (1860) controverted Leo's view that Cynewulf was a Northumbrian, while in his second (1865) he concurs in the first three above-mentioned positions. Wülcker combats these views at length, sometimes with Dietrich's own earlier arguments, and contends especially that Cynewulf was not the author of the *Vision of the Cross*, some verses of which are inscribed on the Ruthwell Cross. He thinks, finally, that Cynewulf wrote with positive certainty only the above-mentioned works, lived in the eighth

century, was a West-Saxon, and probably a scholar of Aldhelm, which view had been previously advanced by Grimm.

A. Holder continues his Collations of Anglo-Saxon Works with—II, *Epistola Alexandri ad Aristotelem*, first published by Cockayne in his *Narratiunculae anglice conscriptae*.

B. Ten Brink begins his *Beiträge zur Englischen Lautlehre* with—I, Introduction—Old English *g* (3)—*hēng* and *heht*; and—II, *ēē* and *ēē* in Middle-English. In the Introduction he concurs with Freeman, Sweet and Zupitza in the designation of the periods of English, so that Old-English=Anglo-Saxon, and with Scherer, as against Sweet, in the opinion that in short *ea*, *eo*, as well as in the diphthongs *ea*, *eo*, *e* forms the preponderating element, as already stated in his essay, "Zum englischen vocalismus" (*Zeitschrift für d. Alt.* XIX, 211). He treats Old-English *g* as of two kinds, *neither* being a proper medial mute, but both palatal-spirants, the first, denoted as *ɣ*¹ (=German *ȝ*) as being used before *clear* (*hellen*) vowels, the second, *ɣ*² (=Netherlandish *g*), before *dull* (*dunkeln*) vowels. He argues further that *e* is long in *hēng*, but short in *heht*. In the second section Ten Brink discusses at length the two sounds *ēē* and *ēē* in Chaucer—1, in Germanic, and—2, in Romanic and Greco-Latin words. He divides the Germanic words into three classes, according to their origin, and finds, by a careful study of Chaucer's rimes, that words of the first class do not rime with those of the third, but those of the second rime with either first or third, perfectly with the former; this shows that words of the second class often have two forms, one with *ēē* and the other with *ēē*. Ten Brink hopes "dass die behandlung das *e*-lauts ein wichtiges kriterium abgeben wird für die grenzbestimmung der dialekte, sowie für die bestimmung der herkunft mittelenglischer gedichte." We can give but a very superficial idea of the thorough treatment of the matters discussed in this article, and must refer phonetists to the article itself. Too little attention has been paid by English grammarians to the study of English sounds, but under the leadership of Ellis, Sweet, and German scholars, a change is taking place.

R. Wülcker contributes a short obituary notice of Ludwig Ettmüller, with a list of his numerous works, which have given him "eine bedeutende stellung in der entwicklungsgeschichte der englischen philologie, so dass wie ihn zu den 'altvätern' dieser noch jungen wissenschaft in Deutschland rechnen dürfen." Wülcker also gives information about Grein's Works. He will continue the *Bibliothek der A. S. Prosa*, and will publish a new edition of the *Poesie* after a collation of the MSS., a new edition of the *Beowulf*, and also of Grein's translation of *Beowulf*.

The book notices open with one by G. Baist, of Hofmann and Vollmöller's edition of *Der Münchener Brut Gottfried von Monmouth in französischen versen des XII, jhd.*, Halle, 1877.

There follows a short notice, by Dr. K. Sachs, of Kölbing's edition of the first volume of Fiedler's *Wissenschaftliche Grammatik der englischen Sprache*, Leipzig, 1877. The first edition of this volume appeared in 1850; meantime the author died, and the second volume (the *Syntax*) was prepared by Sachs (1861). He was obliged to decline the request to prepare a second edition of the first volume, and this was undertaken by Kölbing. Sachs notes the

changes made in this edition, and recommends it to all who wish to make a scientific study of English.

N. Delius reviews at some length Koppel's *Textkritische Studien über Shakespeare's Richard III und King Lear*, Dresden, 1877.

E. Sievers subjects Zupitza's edition of Cynewulf's *Elene*, Berlin, 1877, to a very careful examination and criticism. Sievers welcomes the book as an evidence that greater attention is being paid to Anglo-Saxon poetry, and thinks it high time, for the *Beowulf* has heretofore occupied scholars exclusively, without their having yet given us a "readable edition" (!) of that poem. He notices differences in Zupitza's text from that of Grimm and of Grein, and thinks the *æa*, *eo*, of the former no improvement on *ed*, *ed*, of the latter, for both give rise to misconceptions, which can be avoided only by using combined types which would permit the circumflex to be placed over both vowels together. He objects too to Zupitza's use of *j* for *i* before vowels, and of *g* for *ȝ*, for the letter *g* represents in A. S. "also" the guttural or palatal spirant, and he combats Zupitza's views on this point. He thinks the edition shows a real advance in the marking of quantities, but still takes exception to some words, as to whose quantity he differs from Zupitza. Moreover, Zupitza writes *wēox* as analogous to *sceōp*, a breaking then—as others think—but Sievers says no such form as **wōx* ever occurs: *wēaxan* is therefore a reduplicating verb, and to be consistent Zupitza should write *wēox*. The grammarians are not at one on this point, but most of them put *wēaxan* in the same class with *sceppan* (March's IV). Sievers criticises some of the words in the glossary, but praises the definitions and the exact references. He commends, on the whole, the representation of the text itself, but suggests some emendations, and finally differs from the editor in respect to his use of punctuation. Notwithstanding these minor criticisms, scholars everywhere will be grateful to Zupitza for such a cheap and handy edition of one of the most noted A. S. poems.

M. Trautmann closes the number and volume with a notice of some school-books for instruction in English, by H. Plate, R. Degenhardt, W. Gesenius, and I. Schmidt, and makes some remarks on a better method for instruction in the phonology of the modern languages, in which he finds all grammars totally unsatisfactory. His remarks conclude with an autograph table of the arrangement of the "vowels, consonants, and middle-sounds," according to his method.

The second volume of the *Anglia* will be noticed in a future number of the *Journal of Philology*.

JAMES M. GARNETT.

REVUE ARCHÉOLOGIQUE.

Juillet, 1879.

I. C. Henry, Sur l'origine de quelques notations mathématiques (Suite).

II. E. Revillout, Le Roman de Setna (Suite).

III. Maurice Albert, Sur une villa de Tusculum. In the region of Tusculum, so frequently explored, Albert discovered this villa, not by accident but observation. So excellent a building site as a large platform on a piece of rising ground could hardly have been neglected in this populous region. He searched and found. Exploration, however, was prevented by modern occupation. He discovered—1) A marble disc—one of the already known medallions, which, sculptured on both sides, were used as decoration, being *a*) hung from the ceiling, or *b*) pivoted on a standard between the columns of a portico. Gerhard was wrong in considering them votive shields. Their true use is shown in paintings of Herculaneum. This mode of decoration is peculiar to villas of the first century of the Empire. 2) A tomb close to the wall of the house. This situation of graves close to the house is not uncommon in this region. Under a funeral lamp was an as, the fee of Charon, and by the side of the lamp a tooth, a common thing in graves. The lamp was undecorated, and this plainness is a mark of funeral lamps of the first century of the Empire. 3) In the sarcophagus of a grave not far from the villa was a marble pillow with two hollows in it for the head and neck.

IV. Ferdinand Bompais, Drachme inédite frappée dans l'Étrurie. The woodcut shows on one side a hippocampus and dolphins, on the other is Cerberus. The place of finding is unknown. Bompais' interpretation is that *a*) Hippocampus and dolphins are an allusion to the maritime position of the city which issued the coin, *b*) Cerberus alludes to a cult of infernal deities in the city. The type of Cerberus on coins is extremely rare, only three other cases being known to Bompais. In two cases there was a sanctuary of infernal deities near the city, and in the third some such relation is conjectured. 1. Coin from Elea in Epirus near Acheron and Cocytus. Here was a Plutonium, according to Pouqueville. 2. From Cumae near Lake Avernus. At Cumae, according to Scymnus of Chios (v. 235–240) was a Cerberium. Strabo speaks of a Nekyomanteion in ancient times. 3. At Smyrna was found a Cyzicene. V. Barclay Head thinks it was struck in Cimmerium of the Cimmerian Bosphorus because *a*) it was in constant trade with Cyzicus, whence probably the denomination *b*) the ancient name of Cimmerium was Cerberium, whence, probably, the Cerberus. From these considerations Bompais conjectures that near the city in which our piece was coined was the shrine of a chthonic deity.

Is there an Etruscan city whose coins bear similar emblems of the gloomy side of mythology? Such are some of the coins commonly attributed to Populonia. 1. *Chimaera* (horned lion, tail tipped by dragon's head, no goat's head on the back). 2. The *Gorgoneion* on several coins, symbol of either *a*) death, which would suit our purpose, *b*) the moon (which would not illustrate our coin) in allusion to the city's name, which in its Etruscan form is PVPLVNA. 3. *Sphinx* on several coins. 4. *Cuttlefish* on several, which Bompais takes to be *a*) the Lernean Hydra, *b*) at the same time an allusion to the position of the city on the sea. These terrible beings of mythology correspond to the Cerberus

on one side of our coin. The maritime situation of Populonia agrees with the hippocampus and dolphin on the other. Pliny (3, 8) says Populonia was the only maritime city of the Etruscans, but this does not help us to fix the home of our coin, for Strabo (5, 2, 8) names many other Etruscan towns on the coast.

V. E. Müller, Cure-oreille d'or byzantin portant une inscription grecque. It is twelve centimeters long. The inscription in six lines on six faces begins with a Greek cross, which is found in all Byzantine inscriptions, even those which, like ours, are not of Christian contents.

✠ Ὑγιέν | ουσα χρ | ὦ, κυρᾶ. K | αλῶν κε | ρῶν ἀπο | λαύσης (no ι subscr.). *Salva utere, domina. Felicibus temporibus fruaris.*

The Abbé Martigny (Dict. des antiq. chrét., 1865, p. 467) cites among objects found in Christian graves, wigs, toothpicks and earpicks. In regard to earpicks he is wrong, the object referred to on a plate from Boldetti being an earring. χρῶ and Latin *utere* are common on jewels offered as presents. *ύγιανε* is in several funeral inscriptions, but no other jewel is known to Müller as having it. *καλῶν καιρῶν ἀπολαύσης* is a wish not found on any other remains of this kind. *ἀπολαύσης* in the future¹ (*sic*) is justified by *καιρῶν* which contains a future notion. ε for αι in *ύγιένουσα* and *κερῶν* is an ancient and abundantly attested change in spelling following a change in pronunciation. Thus on a lamp is ΑΠΤΕΑΙ-ΠΑΤΑΘΩ which has been wrongly read by Rayet *ἀπτεῖα ὑπ'* or *ἐπ' ἀγαθῶ*, rightly by Le Blant *ἄπτε ἐπ' ἀγαθῶ*. What is its age? We may assign it to the tenth century A. D., because the shapes of the letters are exactly like those on coins of Constantine Monomachus and his successors.

VI. P. de Cessac, Découverte d'un cimetière des premiers siècles de notre ère. Planches—XV. Disque en marbre. XVI. Monnaies Étrusques.

Août, 1879.

I. F. Bompais, Remarques critiques sur les monnaies à revers lisse attribuées à Populonia. Bompais combats two opinions widely received among numismatists, and maintains:

1. That gold and silver coins are not from Populonia only. The thesis that Populonia was the only town of central Italy to strike coins of gold and silver, the others using only copper, Bompais disproves by adducing two gold and five silver coins with inscriptions which have not been and cannot be read Populonia.

Note.—On one coin is a wheel. Its form is very rare and is not found among any Greek people, but only on Etruscan and Thraco-Macedonian coins. In this Bompais sees proof of a common origin of the two races, Herodotus seeming to say that the Tyrrhenians of Crestona were of one origin with Etruscan Pelasgians (I 57, 94). [Compare Cortona in Etruria]. According to Strabo Caere was founded by Pelasgians from Thessaly. Now Thessaly is not far from Thrace.

2. That coins with plain reverse are not from Populonia only. Coins with plain reverse are peculiar to Etruria. The opinion long and widely held by

¹Aor. subj. used in late Greek as an optative. See Sophocles Lex. Introd. p. 46 2.—B. L. G.

numismatists that these coins were struck by Populonia alone among Etruscan cities is attacked by Bompois. He bases his objection on the great variety of types, so numerous that they could hardly have been the mintage of one city. He adduces coins bearing human heads, Hermes' head, Silenus' head, Gorgon, chimera, cuttlefish (which he calls hydra), hippocampus, a sea monster, lion heads, wild boar, hare, dog, owl, and wheel.

II. Auguste Castan, *L'Épitaque de la prêtresse gallo-romaine Geminia Titulla*. Geminia. Titulla | Arauniensis. Mater | Sacrorum. Hic | Adquiescit — D.(ecimus) Jul.(ius) P(ublii) L(ibertus) Auctus Con(jugi) Pi | issimae. Et Aurae | Severi. Quem. Pro. F(ilio) | Obser(vavit). "Here lies Geminia Titulla of Orange, Mother of the Holy Services. Dec. Jul. Auctus, freedman of Publius, to his faithful and beloved wife and to Aura (wife) of Severus whom he had adopted." Found at Besançon (anc. Vesontio). Date probably third century A. D. The most important element is the priestess' title of *mater sacrorum*, known, so far as Castan is aware, only in one other instance, an inscription from Bordeaux. From this Bordeaux inscription and two others near Besançon, Castan is inclined to regard the title as peculiar to Gaul and to the worship of Mercury, the greatest god in Gaul. On the other hand it may belong to the Taurobolic worship (of Mithras and the Mother of the Gods united), the pontiffs of which bore the title *pater sacrorum*.

III. Ed. Gárnier, *L'hôtel de Soubise*.

IV. Eug. Muntz, *Notes sur les Mosaïques chrétiennes de l'Italie (Suite)*. Planches—XVII–XVIII. Monnaies Étrusques. XIX. Objets trouvés dans les tumuli de Lunkofen.

Septembre, 1879.

I. J. Quicherat, *Une tombe plate dans l'église de Sainte-Praxède à Rome*.

II. A. S. Murray, *La frise orientale du Parthénon*. The frieze of the Parthenon shows a procession.¹ On the west wall is the preparation. Thence proceed eastward two lines on the north and south walls. On the east wall, the heads of the two lines having turned the corners, advance toward one another. In the centre of the eastern frieze are five standing figures, two officiants and three acolytes. On the right of this sacerdotal group are six larger figures seated, supposed to be gods, facing the procession that advances from the south. On the other side of this sacerdotal group are six other seated figures of gods facing the procession that advances from the north. The theory of Murray is as follows: These are not two separate parts of one ceremonial, they are one procession marching two abreast. The sculptor wished to direct the action upon one point. He accordingly divided the procession into two parallel lines on the north and south walls on either side of the spectator. On the east wall, which faces the spectator, perspective, which preserves reality, is denied the sculptor. The scene he had in his mind for the eastern wall was—the head of the procession halted in front of the spectator, further on the sacerdotal group, and in the distance the twelve gods facing the procession and the spectator. The sculptor has put the sacerdotal group in the centre of the frieze, half of the gods on one side of it, half on the other, and one file on each side, each six gods turned sideways toward a file.

¹ See Müller *Denkmäler der alten Kunst*, I 23.—A. D. S.

III. F. Bompais, *Remarques critiques sur les monnaies à revers lisse attribuées à Populonia (Suite)*. 1. Etruscan monetary units. Bompais combats the opinion of the Duc de Luynes that the Etruscan coins followed the old Euboean drachma of 3975 grammes. This has been disproved at length by Vazquez Quiroga (Rev. Numism., 1850, p. 180 ff.). There were, says Bompais, two contemporary units in Etruria. The first and oldest was derived from the Attic, which, in the time of Kleisthenes, was about 4300 gr. The second, as proved by Mommsen (Hist. de la Monn. rom. I 218 ff.), was the Persian, the unit of which was the silver stater of 5440 gr. The existence of two units of these values is proved by Bompais by means of the weights of many coins. 2. XX, X, V (or Λ), IIΔ do not denote values in drachmae. Mommsen's opinion is that the above figures on Etruscan coins denote multiples of drachmae, each being the double of the next following—2 dr., 1 dr., ½ dr., ¼ dr. Bompais shows that whatever they mean they do not denote values. He cites a large number of coins which, though of the same weight, differ in their choice of the above figures.

IV. H. Thédenat, *Sur un cachet d'oculiste découvert à Reims*. One of the many Roman oculists' stamps or seals with inscriptions containing prescriptions of certain physicians for certain diseases of the eye. The inscriptions of our stamp are on the four edges. 1. M(arci) Cl(audii) Martini diacho.(les) ad. leu(coma) Diacho(les): salve of gall (διὰ χολῆς). Leu(coma): white spot on the cornea. 2. M(arci) Filoniani penicil(lum) le(ne) a(d) l(ippitudines). Penicillum: sponge. 3. M(arci) Cl(audii) Martini authem(erum) lene. Authemerum: probably, cure within twenty-four hours. 4. M(arci) Cl(audii) M. . . .

V. F. von Pulsky, *Monuments de la domination celtique en Hongrie*. Planches—XX. Tombe plate. XXI. Figures de la frise orientale du Parthénon.

A. D. SAVAGE.

HERMES. Zeitschrift für classische Philologie, unter Mitwirkung von A. KIRCHHOFF, TH. MOMMSEN, J. VAHLEN, herausgegeben von EMIL HUEBNER. Berlin, Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1879. Vol. XIV.

No. 1. In this number there is a paper by J. G. Droysen On the time of the Nemean festival. The conclusion is that it took place once in two years, summer and winter alternately, but no distinct result seems attainable from the meagre and late evidence that we possess.

Theodore Mommsen discusses the Roman Guards. The *praetoria cohors* was first instituted by the younger Scipio in the war against Sertorius and Numantia. It was not, then, a foundation of Roman imperialism. Under the empire there were nine cohorts of 1000 men each, whose pay was double that of the common legionaries. The four *cohortes urbanae* constituted a separate troop from the praetorians. Mommsen gives a noteworthy Inscription (C. I. L. VI 2725), recording the career of a soldier who passed from service in a legion to the praetorian guards, and afterward passed twenty-three years among the *evocati* as *architectus armamentarii imperatoris* under Domitian, Neroa and Trojan.

Mommsen gives another and purely linguistic paper in this number, discussing the question how Greek ϕ , "the sweetest of the Greek letters," was represented in Roman writing. 1) The old way was by simple p , just as t and ϵ were given of ϑ and χ . 2) from 250 B. C. on by ph , except that the less cultured often continued to write their p . 3) by f under Severus and afterward, noticeable especially in the Latin writing of Greek proper nouns. Coins and first-class official documents generally retain the ph , but after the middle of the fourth century A. D., this too begins to change, emperors calling themselves *triumfactores*, *Filippus*, etc., when f seems to have become the rule of orthography. In conclusion, Mommsen very properly warns scholars against drawing inferences as to laws and rules from the errors and blunders of individual inscriptions.

Ernest Curtius contributes a paper on Sparta and Olympia. He reasserts his views on the relation of Sparta to the sanctuary at Olympia, which have been recently opposed by Busolt, and points out the *political* significance of the alliance. Sparta, being the first of the Peloponnesian communities to acknowledge the Olympian sanctuary, ever after used the moral influence thus acquired for the sustenance and increase of her own political leadership in the Peloponnesus and beyond it. The relation of Delphi to Olympia is also discussed.

J. Olshausen of Berlin, who has done much toward tracing the linguistic influence of the Orient on the Occident in ancient times, has a minor paper on *στόραξ*, *storax*, tracing the Syrian *resin*, cultivated also in Crete, Boeotia, etc., to the name of the Syrian goddess Astarte עֲשֵׁתָרִית.

No. 2. Parerga, by Von Wilamowitz of Greifswald. This is a long series of conjectural emendations of Greek texts, largely from the lyrical writers, from Alcman and Xenophanes down to Callimachus; also from the tragic writers and Aristophanes. Some of these emendations are striking and a few seem plausible, such as Anacreon (fr. 18 Bergk), *χείρεσσιν μαγάδην ἔχων*, and Pindar Nem. 9, 28, *τακτάν* for *ταύταν*.

Von Wilamowitz also has a paper on Phaedon of Elis. This is an attempt to suggest the contents of the lost dialogue entitled Simon, by Phaedon the Socratic. W. draws hints from the twelfth of the Pseudo-Socratic letters, that true virtue could very well take a middle position between those of Antisthenes and Aristippus.

Von Wilamowitz has a third paper on the Galliambi of Callimachus and Catullus. W. suggests that the Galliambus was first extensively used by the Greek poets of the beginning of the third century B. C., and most skilfully by Callimachus of Cyrene; and that Catullus' poem on Attis is not so much a translation as an imitation of the Callimachean Galliambi.

J. Vahlen of Berlin, the successor of Haupt, contributes a paper on Plato Philebus 25, D. E.: *συμμίγνυν δέ γε εἰς αὐτὴν τὸ μετὰ ταῦτα κ.τ.λ.*, his interpretation being occupied especially about *καταφανὲς κἀκείνη γενήσεται*. Throughout he opposes any change of the received text, and, in opposition to Badham, denies the necessity of any emendation. Vahlen's remarks on the *impersonal* use of *δράσει* will interest Greek grammarians generally (cf. p. 210 sq.).

C. A. Lehmann of Berlin, gives a number of emendations of passages in Ciceronian orations.

H. Fiedke writes on the relation between the caesura and the accent in the hexameter of Nonnus.

H. Schrader of Hamburg, *Porphyrius bei Eustathius zur Boeotia*, discusses what Eustathius derived from the Homeric books of the Neoplatonist Porphyrius, and through what channels; he also attempts to identify other notes in the Homeric Scholia as Porphyrian, where the name of P. is not given.

J. Draheim of Berlin, *De Arte Ovidii*, discusses a peculiar metrical habit of Ovid in his practice of elision.

Robinson Ellis of England, *Emendationes Inscriptionum*, refers to the collection of epigrams recently published by Kaibel.

A. Jordan of Wernigerode, in an article, *Zur Kritik der spaeteren Platoniker*, discusses some of the MSS. containing commentaries of later Platonists, and points to a Vienna MS. (Philos. Graec. No. 314), as the leading one in value.

H. Jordan of Koenigsberg, the noted classical scholar and archaeologist, under the comprehensive title of *Vermischte Bemerkungen*, presents four distinct minor papers. 1) An emendation of Frontinus (*de aquis*). 2) A discussion of Horace, Ode IV 8, *Donarem pateras*. Here he makes a spirited and suggestive defence of the received reading, esp. of v. 13, *non incisa notis marmora publicis*. 3) Discusses two Pompeian wall-paintings of trifles, containing rather faint inscriptions (an address of a letter, and distichs). J. attempts a restoration. Corrupt forms in the conversational Latin of the period may be of interest to the general scholar: *cuscus=quisquis*, *periat=pereat*, *valiat=valeat*. 4) A critical paper discussing Simonides of Amorgos, the satirical poem on women, by J., assumes several interpolations, of which he makes out the principal one to be from vs. 94 to the end.

H. Haupt of Würzburg, being engaged in a comprehensive study of the Byzantine historians, contributes the third and last of a series of papers concerning the extracts of Planudes, supposed by some to be derived from Dio Cassius.

In the remainder of this number are minor notes, of which we give some of the titles: On Ketriporis of Thrace, by Dittenberger of Halle. A misunderstood expression of Heraclitus, by E. Petersen of Dorpat. The Priapus-elegy of Tibullus, by the Editor. On Pausanias, an archaeological communication, by C. Robert of Berlin. On Stobaeus' *Florilegium*, by P. Thomas of Ghent, etc., etc.

No. 3. Johannes Schmidt of Rome, On the *Evocati*, a contribution to Roman antiquities. The *Evocati* (*οἱ ἀνέκλητοι*) were a special select grade in the non-commissioned Roman military, being found as a distinct feature principally from Augustus into the third century A. D. They were picked men invited to further service after having completed their *stipendia*. They seem to have been mostly of the praetorians. Schmidt has made extensive use of the inscriptions of the imperial era.

R. Hirzel of Leipzig, *Democritus' Schrift περὶ εὐθυμίας*, a very extensive paper (pp. 354-407). Hirzel traces the influence of Democritus' treatise, π. εὐθ., in Seneca *de tranquillitate animi*, and finds further hints about its contents in the Pseudo-Hippocratean correspondence, and in the polemic against Democritus which he claims to find in Plutarch *περὶ εὐθυμίας*. He holds it probable that at the time of Cicero, of Horace, of Juvenal and of Clement of Alexandria, it was the only ethical treatise of Democritus which was read and preserved in its integrity. He attempts to assign to the treatise *περὶ εὐθυμίας* many other Democritean fragments which are preserved under other titles in extant

collections (Mullach). The well-known traditions of Democritus as the "laughing philosopher," and of the stupidity of the Abderites, he traces to the indirect influence of this same treatise.

Benedict Niese of Marburg, writes on Thukydides bei Stephanus, producing several corrections of the MS. from Stephanus of Byzantium: 'Αφροδιτία for 'Αφροδισία (IV 56), Κυνουρίας for Κυνουσουρίας (ibid.), Μεταπίους for Μεσσαπίους (III 121), and the insertion of καὶ 'Αμφίλοχοι after ὁ ποτε 'Ακαρνᾶνες (III 105). In all these passages the tradition of Thucydides in Stephanus seems really to be superior to that of the Thucydidean MSS.

H. Haupt continues his discussions of the fragments of Dio Cassius.

C. A. Lehmann of Berlin, in his *Questiones Tullianae*, continues his critical remarks on Ciceronian passages.

M. Niemeyer of Berlin, Zu Plautus, offers critical remarks on *Asinaria* 105 [adding *tum*], *Captivi* 463, *Capt.* 21, 22, *Asin.* 280, *Mercator* 312, *Miles* 1162, *Stichus* 313 foll.

Fr. Novati of Pisa, reports on a list of Aristophanic plays contained in the MS. at Milan (Cod. Ambrosianus). The number given is forty-four. The pieces given in the list as having had two editions are *Διολοσίκων*, *Θεσμοφοριάζονσαι*, *Νεφέλαι*, *Πλούτος*. Various corrections of Suidas' article on Aristophanes result from the list in this MS.

E. G. SIHLER.

ATHENAION.¹ The *Athenaion*, edited by PROFS. KUMANUDIS and KASTORCHIS, is one of the best and most solid periodicals published in Europe. It is now in its eighth year, and in spite of the limited number of its subscribers, increases in interest and value. Besides numerous articles on philological subjects, it contains excellently digested accounts of all new excavations and discoveries. From recent numbers, I glean the following notes of recent excavations in Greece:

1. The Rock-Tombs at Nauplia. In two passages of his *Geography*, Strabo makes mention of caves in the neighborhood of Nauplia (*hod.* Navplion). Judging from his words, they must have been of considerable dimensions: ἐφεξῆς δὲ τῇ Ναυπλίᾳ τὰ σπήλαια καὶ οἱ ἐν αὐτοῖς λαβύρινθοι, Κυκλώπεια δ' ὀνομάζουσιν, H, 6, p. 369 *ad init.*; καὶ ἴσως τὰ σπήλαια τὰ περὶ τὴν Ναυπλίαν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐταῖς ἔργα τούτων (i. e. τῶν Κυκλώπων) ἐπώνυμά ἐστιν, p. 373 *ad init.*

In August, 1878, Prof. Kastorchis of Athens, being on a visit to Nauplia, took occasion carefully to excavate and examine certain small caves, which have long been known to exist in the neighborhood. He found them nine in number and situated on the N. E. slope of the fortress hill, Palamidi, close by the suburb Pronoia. It seems to have been taken for granted by archaeologists that these are the *σπήλαια* mentioned by Strabo; but inasmuch as they do not at all correspond to his description, it has been supposed that he wrote from hearsay and was thus inaccurate. Though this is quite possible, it would hardly be safe, with our present knowledge, to affirm that there did not exist in

¹ Ἀθῆναιον, σύγγραμμα περιοδικὸν κατὰ διμηνίαν ἐκδιδόμενον συμπράξει πολλῶν λογίων. Ἀθῆνησιν, ἐκ τοῦ τυπογραφείου Ἑρμοῦ.

Strabo's time, or even that there do not exist now, caves of much larger dimensions than those found, and capable of containing labyrinths, whatever that term may mean.¹ All that we can say is, that the ancients were acquainted with caves in the neighborhood of Nauplia, and that caves are still to be found there. Those examined by Prof. Kastorchis were, with one exception, turned toward the north, and resembled in form the so-called treasuries at Mykênæ, or still more the tombs discovered at Spata (Σφηττός?) in the Mesogaia, some three years ago. They were, however, much smaller than either, and had all been previously opened and robbed of their contents. Toward the end of September two other tombs were found in the same neighborhood, one of them apparently untouched. In this were found four skeletons, one large vase and eleven small ones, six human images closely resembling those found by Dr. Schliemann at Tiryns and Mykênæ (vid. Mykênæ, plates A, B, C), one image of an ox, and three sea-shells. There is nothing to show that the bodies in these tombs had ever been subjected to the action of fire. The tombs themselves are of various sizes and shapes, but none of them, apparently, are more than ten feet square or seven high. Some are square, some nearly round, some have the ceiling and doorway arched, others have two sides of the ceiling meeting at an angle and the top of the doorway horizontal. There can be little doubt a very large number of tombs still remain untouched on the slope of Palamidi, and that when these are thoroughly investigated by the Greek Archaeological Society, which has undertaken regular excavations, fresh light will be thrown upon the question of an early Egyptian settlement in the Argolid. Pausanias (IV 35, 2), as is known, tells us: ἦσαν δὲ οἱ Ναυπλιεῖς, ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν, Αἰγύπτιοι τὰ παλαιότερα· παραγενόμενοι δὲ ὁμοῦ Δαναῶ ναυσὶν εἰς τὴν Ἀργολίδα ὕστερον γενεαῖς τρισὶν ὑπὸ Ναυπλίου τοῦ Ἀμυμώνης κατφκίσθησαν ἐν Ναυπλίᾳ.

2. The Rock-Tomb at Acharnae. During the months of April, May and June last, an arched rock-tomb, very similar to those at Spata, and discovered some six years ago close by Menidhi (the ancient Acharnae), was excavated by the German Archaeological School of Athens, of which Dr. Ulrich Köhler is the head. In it were found a large number of articles in gold, silver, bronze, ivory, stone, glass, terra-cotta, etc., having an unmistakable kinship with those found at Mykênæ and Spata. There was discovered neither iron, coin, nor inscription, and, what is very remarkable, not a single image in clay. This seems to furnish a decisive proof of what was previously suspected, viz: that the treasures found in the tombs of Mykênæ belong to a different people from that which owned the rude clay images found in the earth above them, and that Greece in early times had a Middle Dark Age.

3. The Dipylon Gate in Athens. The Greek Archaeological Society, in spite of the many difficulties thrown in its way, has for months been pursuing

¹ There is especial difficulty in identifying the caves described by the ancients. Pausanias describes one in the neighborhood of Marathon thus (I 32, 7): ὀλίγον δὲ ἀπωτέρω τοῦ πεδίου Πανός ἐστιν ὄρος καὶ σπήλαιον θῆας ἄξιον ἐσοδος μὲν ἐς αὐτὸ στενὴ, παρελθούσι δὲ εἰσὶν οἴκοι καὶ λουτρά καὶ τὸ καλούμενον Πανὸς αἰπόλιον, πέτραι τὰ πολλὰ αἰξίν εἰκασμέναι." Lolling (Mittheil. des deutschen Archaeol. Inst. in Athen., Vol. I, p. 72, sqq.), makes these words apply to a cave on a hill near Ninoi (Οἰνόη). I examined this cave with great care, and find it impossible to believe that it ever contained οἴκοι or λουτρά. It has *three* εἰσοδοί, all equally στεναί. Possibly the cave of Pan has not yet been discovered.

excavations near the Dipylon to the east of the Hagia Trias, and has succeeded in laying bare a considerable portion of the ancient city wall, in an excellent state of preservation, sixteen layers high, and lacking, apparently, nothing but the embrasures. It forms a right angle, of which one side runs to the north and the other to the west. A portion also of the outer wall of the fosse was found, and remains of houses outside of it.

4. Eleusis and Delphi. The same society, having bought up a large number of the houses that at present occupy the sites of Eleusis and Delphi, are preparing to buy the remainder, and then to commence excavations in both places. The inhabitants are glad of the opportunity thus offered them of parting advantageously with their property, and removing elsewhere. The beautiful, large basin into which the fountain of Kastalia flows, has recently been cleared of the stones and mud that encumbered it, and is found to be almost uninjured, in spite of the frequent earthquakes.

5. The Lion of Chaironeia. This noble work of ancient sculpture, far superior to the famous Thorwaldsen lion at Lucerne, has for many years lain in fragments close to its pedestal. The Greek Archaeological Society is now taking measures to put the colossal fragments together and restore the monument of Greece's downfall to its original position.

THOMAS DAVIDSON.

NEUE JAHRBÜCHER FÜR PHILOGIE U. PAEDAGOGIK, herausgegeben v. FLECKEISEN u. MASIUS, 1879.

No. 7. H. Müller-Strübing of London, Concerning the battle of Marathon. This paper, the writer says, was suggested to him by Wecklein's Ueber die Tradition der Perserkriege, Munich Academy, 1876. He corrects or criticises the Herodotean and Plutarchean tradition in several points, maintaining especially: 1) That it was not the tribe *Aeantís* which had the position on the right wing, but the *Oenets*, Miltiades' own, although the latter, as commander-in-chief, had a position in the centre. 2) He disbelieves the narrative that the Athenian army marched back to the city on the day of the battle. This view is based on physical and topographical considerations.

Ch. Herwig of Elberfeld, Concerning the question of *responsio* in Aeschylus, Agamemnon 1331-1343. The writer arranges thus: *α* (1331-1334), *β* (1335-37), *β'* (1338-1340), and *α'* (1341-43), the fourth and last *σύντημα* being interrupted by the cry of Agamemnon from the palace. To make things tally, he inserts in vs. 1343, *καί; καὶ τὰδ' ἀκούων*.

Fr. Kern of Stettin, discusses a number of passages in Sophocles' Antigone. He suggests a lacuna of one verse between 23 and 24, explains and defends ὀρθῶς *φίλη* in 99, recommends some alteration of *παντὸς ἀνδρὸς* in 175, as *παντὶ τάνδρῳ*; proposes a slight change in 743: *οὐ γὰρ δίκαι', ἂ σ' ἐξαμαρτάνωνθ' ὀρῶ*, and takes umbrage at *πᾶσ'* in 776. His last suggestion is *ἐπ' ἐσχατον* v. 853, for *ἐπ' ἐσχατον*.

A. Dederich of Emmerich, presents a number of emendations in Livy XXI, twenty in all. This paper deserves the careful reading of all students of Livy. The author is an old teacher of long experience, recently retired. His command

of the critical material seems very complete, and he frequently points out in a very instructive manner the genesis of corruptions. The space destined for these reports forbids an elaborate discussion of Dederich's readings. Still, as many teachers read Livy XXI with classes, it may be serviceable to note at least the passages discussed: c. 3, In Hasdrubalis locum—*sequebatur*; c. 5, non petisse Saguntinos, etc., where D. reads *iungendis quoque* instead of *iungendoque*; c. 7, oriundi a Zacyntho . . . Rutulorum qui *quondam* generis; c. 8, oppidani ad omnia—non sufficebant, he inserts *postquam* before *multifariam*. In c. 10 he reads *Hanno egit: per deos, foederum arbitros ac testis, oratione suadentis, . . . monuisse; praedixisse se*, etc.; c. 17, duas legiones Romanas et decem milia sociorum . . . Gallia provincia *nondum* (instead of *eodem*) versa in Punicum bellum habuit. In this passage he makes great use of Polybius. c. 22, *tuendae maritimae orae*; c. 25, nec, dum *parumper* in patentia loca ducebatur agmen apparuit hostis; c. 28, ut *tum* elephantii. In c. 31 Dederich defends the received reading: quod ea senatus principumque sententia *fuerat*; c. 33, *partibus deversis* e rupibus (instead of perversis rupibus); c. 36, iumenta secabant *cum tabidam* (or tabem) *tum* infimam . . . ingredientia nivem, cf. Polyb. III 55; c. 38, Taurini *Hannibali* proxima gens erat in Italiam degresso (instead of *Galliae*); c. 40, ac nihil magis vereor *ne cui umquam*, vos cum pugnaveritis, Alpes vicisse Hannibalem videantur. c. 41, neque regressus ad navis <*satis tutus*> erat; c. 43, dextra laevaue duo maria claudunt et nullam . . . navem *habetis, vobis* circa Padus, etc. (instead of *habentibus*); c. 48, iamque in loca altiora *eaque tumulis* impeditiora equiti (or *equis*); c. 49, extemplo a praetore et circa civitates missi legati tribunique, qui suos . . . intenderent, ante omnia Lilybaeum *intueri* iussi, *ad* paratum belli edicto proposito, ut . . . deferrent et . . . ne quis . . . facere et; perque omnem oram qui ex speculis prospicerent adventantem hostium classem, dimissi; c. 52, maior tamen quam hostium Romanorum fama victoriae fuit; c. 59, pugna raro magis ulla *aequa* aut utriusque partis <*pari*> pernicis clarior.

There is another critical Latin paper by R. Unger, *Emendations to the Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, pp. 493–512.

No. 8. R. Meister of Leipzig, *Concerning the Chronology of Boeotian Vocalism*, mostly drawn from inscriptions in Ionic characters, from the beginning of the fourth century to the beginning of Roman sway in Greece, about 150 B. C. According to Meister, the retention of original *oi* or *v*, or of *v* side by side with (later) *ov* indicates the fourth century; *v* for *oi* belongs to the third; a mixture of common forms with Boeotian points to 200–150 B. C.

H. Stadtmüller of Heidelberg, and I. Kvicala of Prague, contribute criticisms of passages in Euripides, generally involving real difficulties; St. on fragm. 803, v. 4; Hippol. 638; Hercul. fur. 1151, fragm. 340; Alcest. 1134 and 827. Kvicala on Heracl. 133; Hercul. fur. 617; Ion 382 (defending the current reading); Bacchae 860; Phoenissae 845 sq.

W. Herbst of Halle, discusses critically seven passages in Thucydides, mostly such as have engaged critics a great deal before, and as such these passages may be here cited: I, 25, 4, *περιφρονοῦντες δὲ αὐτοὺς κ.τ.έ*; I, 51, 1, *οὐχ ὅσας ἐώρων ἄλλα <καὶ> πλείους*; I, 70, 1, *καὶ ἅμα <ἡμεῖς> εἶπερ τινεῖς*; 2, 13, 1, *ἐπὶ κακῷ γε τῆς πόλεως γένοιτο <τοῦτο>*; 2, 15, 4, *τὰ γὰρ ἱερὰ . . .* The most important is 2, 35, 1, *καὶ μὴ ἐν ἐνὶ ἀνδρὶ . . . πιστευθῆναι*. H. strikes out

πιστευθῆναι. This is plausible, and Herbst mentions that it had previously occurred to Van Herwerden without his knowledge. 2, 44, I, οἷς ἐνευδαμονῆσαι . . . ξυνεμετρήθη.

W. Gebhardi of Meseritz, Zum ersten Buche von Vergilius Aeneis, pp. 561–578.

1) vs. 653 sqq., he now reads:

praeterea sceptrum Priami colloque monile
maxima natarum Ilione quod gesserat olim
bacatum et duplicem gemmis auroque coronam.

a change ably set forth and well defended. 2) vs. 395, the simile of the swans. 3) vs. 534, with a general discussion of incomplete lines in Vergil, he suggests a period after *hic cursus fuit*. 4) vs. 188, he brackets *fidus quae tela gerebat Achilles*. 5) vs. 455 sqq., Aeneas beholding the pictures of Trojan scenes; Gebhardi insists that these verses are in a hopeless muddle. 6) An archaeological excursus on the pictures themselves, in which he insists that we must not think of sculptures as, for instance, Weidner does. 7) Purely exegetical on vs. 495. 8) Minor alterations: vs. 747, ingeminant *plausum*, vs. 729, *qua* Belus; 721, *pervertere*; 707, *lumina* instead of *limina*; vs. 646, *caro* instead of *cari*. The famous line, 574, he now reads thus: Tros Tyriusve, mihi nullo discrimine agetur, "whether it be a Trojan or Tyrian, my action will not be determined thereby." 9) Specimens of improvement in punctuation.

In the *Noctes Scholasticae* of this number there is a very suggestive and readable discourse on methods and aims of classical study at the German universities and on the professional preparation for classical teaching.

E. G. S.

MNEMOSYNE, Vol. VII, Part II.—This number contains papers by Cobet, Badham, Francken, Van Herwerden, and Cornelissen. Besides giving three emendations for passages of Diodorus Siculus and two for Aulus Gellius, Cobet has an article of sixty-six pages on Cicero's Philippics. Forty-one of these are taken up with emendations and illustrations of the text, while the remainder of the article is devoted to a criticism of the trustworthiness of Cicero in regard to his statement of facts. It may be well to give some characteristic specimens of Cobet's textual criticisms:

Phil. II 3, 6. *Cum omnes impuritates impudica in domo susci-peres vino lustrisque confectus*. Sic scribitur ex auctoritate Codicis Vaticanici et Nonii Marcelli, quum sana ratio *pudica* postulet. Namque *pudica in domo* est in domo, quae Cn. Pompeii fuerat, *impudica in domo* est in domo TUA, in qua quum quotidie omnes impuritates susci-perentur quam fatuum est addere *impudicam* illam domum fuisse. Comparandus es locus Philipp. II 25, 69 *quid enim unquam domus illa (Pompeii) viderat nisi pudicum, quid nisi ex optimo more et sanctissima disciplina?*

On Phil. II 9, 21, *tu illum* (Antonius Clodium) *in foro spectante populo Romano gladio insecutus es*, he repudiates the reading *spectante*, though taken by Halm *ex optimo codice* (Vaticano) saying "utrum quoque loco *spectare* an *inspectare* verum sit non pendet a libris sed a verborum intelligentia," and then goes on

to show that whereas *spectare* is applied to the being present at games and shows, *inspectare* is used by Cicero only in the ablative of the present participle, in such expressions as *inspectante me, nobis inspectantibus*. The word in the sentences quoted above should be therefore *inspectante* in the sense of *in conspectu populi, ante oculos populi*, "habetque coniunctam notionem impudentiae cujusdam et audaciae," and to confirm this he quotes (and happily does not merely refer to) several passages.

In Phil. II 14, 35, where the editions read *ad aedem Opis*, he insists on the omission of *aedem*, maintaining that in such cases the accusative or ablative is always to be omitted after *ad, ante, a, pone*, whereas "*in et pro* hanc ellipsin non admittunt aut non requirunt."

In Phil. II 18, 44, he desires to insert *is* after *Clodio* in the words "intimus erat in tribunatu Clodio, qui sua erga me beneficia commemorat," explaining the sense required by *φίλτατος ἦν τῷ Κλωδίῳ ὁ τὰς ἐαυτοῦ περὶ ἐμὲ ἐνεργεσίας διηγούμενος*.

On III 11, 27, "O C. Caesar, adolescentem appello, quam tu salutem rei publicae attulisti," he remarks: "quae tandem est sententia verborum *adolescentem appello*? Cur *adolescentem* eum vocat? an ne cum patre confunderetur? absurdum hoc quidem est. Quid igitur dixerat? nempe *O Cai Caesar, ABSENTEM* appello; ut in Phil. I 13, 31. *Tu autem, M. Antoni*, absentem appello, unum illum diem—non omnibus auteponis?"

In Phil. V 4, 10, he insists on writing *coloniis* for *colonis*, remarking, "ineptum est in talibus aliquid libris credere. In Vaticano locis innumerabilibus I et II, IS et IIS confusa videbis. Utra sit ubique lectio potior et vera nostri iudicii est."

On Phil. V 12, 31, where Halm has, in deference to the Vatican MS., omitted *afferemus*, while it is required by the sense, Cobet remarks: "non quodlibet vocabulum per ellipsin recte omittitur, sed ea tantum quae legentibus vel audientibus certa statim in mentem venire debent: *tam bonus gladiator rudem tam cito*."

Phil. VII 6, 16, is emended in accordance with a passage in Suetonius, *Caes. 41*, in which reference Cobet is anticipated by Nipperdey, *Philol. III*, p. 145.

Phil. VIII 6, 19, he emends *quotidie aliquid iracundiae remittebat*, saying "postulat Latine loquentium consuetudo ut rescribatur: *quotidie aliquid DE iracundia* remittebat," citing several passages to show that in such cases *de* or *ex* is always used.

On Phil. X 3, 6, *legiones abducis a Bruto. Rursus igitur vis nudatum illum atque solum a re publica relegatum videri*, he remarks, "quid sibi vult *videri*? Quid est? an *δοκεῖν*? an *existimari*? Nihil minus. Qui Brutum oderant eum copiis nudatum *esse*, non *videri* volebant. Emendata una literula legendum: *vis nudatum viderē* et ea re oculos pascere."

In Phil. X 7, 15, *qui C. Caesaris RES actas everti—volunt* he corrects *Caesaris ACTA*, saying "res *gestae* usitate dicitur res *actae* non item.—RES post *CAESARIS* ex dittographia natum est, deinde ACTA ad RES accommodatum in ACTAS est conversum."

In Phil. X 8, 16, he desires to insert *non* before *acrius*, which seems unnecessary if its usual ironical force be allowed to the parenthetical *credo*.

But Cobet's passing remarks on the text of these orations are by no means confined to conjectural emendations of more or less probability. He anticipates

on occasion the purpose of the latter part of his article, by calling attention to the watchfulness with which Cicero's statements of fact must be scrutinized. As an example, he quotes from Phil. III 7, 17, Cicero's protests against the enormity of Antony's charging Q. Cicero the younger with a contemplated assassination of his father and uncle: *in eum adolescentem hoc scribere audere, quem ego et frater meus propter eius suavissimos atque optimos mores praestantissimumque ingenium certatim amamus omnibusque horis oculis, auribus, complexu tenemus*. And says, "haec omnia Cicero temporis causa mentitur; nam satis constat Quintum filium nequissimum nebulonem propter eius perditissimos et pessimos mores patri, patruo, et avunculo, Attico, odiosum admodum et invisum fuisse." And he then quotes a number of passages from the letters to Atticus by which this latter judgment is confirmed. The single letter (ad Att. XVI 5, 2), in which he speaks pleasantly of Quintus was a mere blind, "nihil in his veri est, nihil ex animi sententia dictum. Cicero qui nihil suis impudenter rogantibus negare poterat, in hac re astutus fuit et διπλοῦς ἀνὴρ." In another letter he tells Atticus that he has written before at the request of his brother and nephew. "EAE NE TE MOVERINT." Cobet refers the credit of this discovery of Cicero's duplicity to Tunstall in his letter to Middleton. And in several other illustrations he adduces he has been forestalled by others. For example, on Phil. XII 2, 5, and XIII 1, 1 and 21. 49, he makes quotations, Greek and Latin, which are already in the notes.

The latter part of the article (pp. 154-179) is devoted to establishing that Cicero's statements as to Antony's atrocities and to the deference which Octavianus paid to the Senate, and other matters, are wholly untrustworthy. He says: "Multa Cicero odio incensus et inflammatus ira dixit, non nunquam de magnis maiora loquitur, interdum nimium tribuit auguriis suis rerum futurarum et quae eventura esse certo credebat vera et certa esse putavit: est etiam ubi temporis causa (plane et Latine dicam) mentitus est," and says further on that in his narrative Cicero followed his own rule, de Orat. II § 241 *si habeas vere quod narrare possis, tamen est mendaciunculis adspargendum*. To discredit Cicero's statements he relies mainly on Appian, and especially on a speech of Piso which is recorded by him; but he avails himself also of Cicero's own language in the letters to Brutus, of which he promises at some future time to establish the genuineness and authenticity. After quoting one patriotic passage from Phil. X 10, 20, he says, "verba haec sunt rebus contraria; illa *S(entina) P(opuli) Q(uondam) R(omani)* erat ad serviendum parata."

The next article is by Prof. Badham of Sidney, containing miscellaneous criticisms on the text of Plato's Philebus, Demosthenes, de Corona, Thucydides, lib. I and Euripides, Medea. A single specimen may be given. Dem. de Cor. § 147 *εἰ μὲν οὖν τῆς ἰδίας ἐνεκ' ἐχθρας ἢ τοὺς Θετταλοὺς ἢ τοὺς Θηβαίους συμπεῖθοι βαδίζειν ἐφ' ἡμᾶς, οὐδένα ἡγεῖτο προσέξειν αὐτῷ τὸν νοῦν, ἐὰν δὲ τὰς ἐκείνων κοινὰς προφάσεις λαβὼν ἡγεμὼν αἰρεθῇ ῥῆον ἡλπίζε τὰ μὲν παρακροῖσθαι τὰ δὲ πείσειν*. Haec non modo in grammaticam peccant (*εἰ συμπεῖθοι ἡγεῖτο*—ἐὰν αἰρεθῇ ἡλπίζε) sed plane falsa sunt et rei naturae contraria. Quid enim? nonne hanc ipsam ob causam fallaciis utebatur ut dux crearetur? Quod ut semel assecutus est deposita simulatione vi agere coepit. Quae vero sunt illa κοινὰ προφάσεις Thessalorum Thebanorumque? Si voluissent Atheniensibus bellum inferre nullius προφάσεως indigebant. Philippo contra necesse erat προφάσεις λαβεῖν

quibus hos in societatem adduceret. Quas ergo? nempe τὰ κοινὰ Thessalorum et Thebanorum. Scribendum igitur τὰ δ' ἐκείνων κοινὰ προφάσεις λαβὼν (vel εἰ δὲ τὰ κείνων κοινὰ π. λάβοι) ῥᾶον ἤλπιζε τὰ μὲν παρακροῖσθαι τὰ δὲ πείσειν.

A paper then follows by C. M. Francken on the Epidicus of Plautus. The first part of it is devoted to the discovery of additional evidence of the *duplex recensio* of the play as already demonstrated by Reinhardt and Goetz. This is one of his arguments. In 276 Periphanes is urged to feign a love for the music girl. Nothing comes of this; but in 415 it is said that she was induced to come to his house willingly because she supposed that she was to take part in the performances at a sacrifice. The latter is clearly a better motive. Therefore, vv. 276-280, belong to a first edition.

Again, in 314 Epidicus speaks of having received an order from Periphanes to hire a music girl to assist at a sacrifice. In 417, Apocides, talking to Periphanes, mentions this as if it were "rem commenticiam." Therefore, 314 belongs to the prior recension.

In 500 the music girl tells Apocides and Periphanes that she was hired to perform at a sacrifice. Here is no deception. But in 317 and 371 Epidicus tells Stratippocles that he will procure the girl to delude the old man. This discrepancy is to be accounted for by the same consideration. From 385 all goes on consistently; therefore we may infer that the former portion must belong to the unrevised edition.

After this discussion Francken proceeds to criticise various lines in the play and emend them. For instance, v. 65, which in B. J. read: THESP. Deperit. EPID. Detegetur corium de tergo meo, he suggests: Deperit. De tergo corium detergebatur meo.

In 490, which Goetz gives: nam pró fidicina haec *cérva* suppositást tibi, Francken does not know whether it is intended to make allusion to the sacrifice of Iphigenia, and says: "eiusmodi reminiscencias in Plauto non temere admittendas." He thinks the letters of the MSS. suggest: nam pro fidicina vera haec suppositast tibi.

The next paper contains emendations of certain of Lucian's writings by Van Herwerden.

In *Somnium*, 4, he desires various changes, particularly proposing *ἀνακτησαμένης* δέ με τῆς μητρός for *ἀγανακτησαμένης*. In c. 13 he would read *χιτωνίσκον τινὰ* instead of *χιτώνιον τι*, on the ground that we see from Lexiph. 35 that Lucian recognized the latter as being *γυναικὸς ἐσθῆς*. In the same passage he proposes *κάγκοπέας* for *καὶ κοπέας*, because the former was the word for "chisel" used in c. 3. In c. 18, he prefers τὰ ἤττω of Reitz to τὴν ἤττω of Jacobitz (though he would prefer to read τὰ χείρω), thus keeping φύσιν as object of *διαφθεύρων*.

In *Nigrin*, c. 24, πῶς γὰρ οἶε τὴν ψυχὴν διατεθεῖσθαι μοι, he proposes *διατίθεσθαι*, not only "quod illa forma non solet Lucian. cum faece Graeculorum uti pro *διακεῖσθαι*," but also because the present is more proper. In c. 37, τὸ βέλος—μένει τε καὶ πολλὸν τοῦ φαρμάκου ἀφίησιν, he proposes *ἐμμένει* and *ἐνίησιν*, comparing *Xen. Mem. I 3, 12, ἐνίησι γάρ τι τὰ φαλάγγια κατὰ τὸ δῆγμα*.

In *Iudicium Vocalium* 2, where Σ complains of the neglect into which he is falling, and says that it is nearly come to this, that ἐν ἰσῷ κείσθαι τοῦ ψόφου, he proposes τῷ ψόφῳ, referring to *Plat. Theaet. 174 e, τό τε σίγμα τῶν ἀφώνων ἐστί, ψόφος τις μόνον*.

Similar criticisms are made on the Timon, Prometheus, Halcyon, and the Dialogi Deorum, Mortuorum, and Marini.

The last article is by J. J. Cornelissen, proposing emendations on Tibullus. The most probable of them seems to be this: II 5, 81, Et succensa sacris crepitet bene laurea flammis, Òmine quo felix et sacer annus eat, where he proposes *satur* for *sacer*.

On I 10, 15, Sed patrii servate Lares: aluistis et idem, Cursarem vestros cum tener ante pedes, his comment is: ridicule poeta se ipsum, tenellum infantem, cursantem facit ante Larium pedes. Ni autem fallor, scripsit *curarer*!

C. D. MORRIS.

ROMANIA.—The following report aims at giving a brief summary of the more important articles contained in Nos. 30 and 31 of the Romania for 1879. Limited space would not allow anything more than a rough statement of the conclusions arrived at by the writers, nor has it been found practicable to discuss or criticise these conclusions except in a few instances.

No. 30 begins with an article by H. d'Arbois de Jubainville, entitled Des rapports de la versification du vieil irlandais avec la versification romane. After a brief examination of some of the most common types of Irish verse, the writer concludes that the facts obtained up to the present time contain nothing of sufficient importance to establish the supposed relations of Irish versification with the Romance. It is possible, he admits, that the versification of the prehistoric Irish may have followed the laws of that of the Gauls; but there is nothing to show that the laws of the former were identical with those of the old Irish versification. The revolution which, in modifying the language, destroyed the measure of the prehistoric verse, may have created a new system of versification. The laws of the old Irish verse, then, teach us nothing definite with reference to that of the prehistoric Irish. We cannot prove and are not justified in assuming, that the prehistoric Irish had either the quatrain, the verse of seven syllables, assonance or alliteration. We have no reason, therefore, to attribute to the Gauls the laws of versification of the old Irish. The Gauls must have possessed these laws themselves, in order to transmit them to the Provençal and French; but this is not proved. Moreover, if the Gauls had transmitted them to the Provençal and French, the latter would have observed them, which is not the case. The quatrain is not the fundamental principle of Provençal and French versification; alliteration is not one of its ornaments; nor has the verse of seven syllables the same importance in Provençal and French as in Irish. The writer further maintains that he finds nothing in the popular (*vulgaire*) versification of the Romans (in which it is thought the Provençal and French had its origin), that may be considered in his opinion as the type of the Irish quatrain.

L'imparfait du subjonctif en -es (provençal) by Paul Meyer. The imperfect of the subjunctive in Provençal has two terminations, -es and -is: *am-es* and *part-is*, which in certain provinces are lengthened to *amessa* and *partissa*. The author confines his examination to the former of these endings (*es*), and proceeds to show that, though identical in spelling, these verbal terminations are

quite different in sound, some having the narrow *e* (*e estroit*), others the wide *e* (*e large*). The proof of this is to be found in the fact that certain of these endings nearly always rime with words known to contain the narrow *e* (*és*), while others rime with words having the wide *e* (*ès*). Faidit, in his table of rimes, gives the following words under the rubric of *es large*: *pes, confes, ades* and *pres*. From various poems of the troubadours, Meyer collects imperfect subjunctives that rime with these words, such as *chantes, mandes, celes, ames, tornes, nasques, trobes, adjudes*, etc. He then gives a number in the same tense from the Flamenca, as, for instance, *agues, conogues, degues, pogues*, which rime with each other or with words whose *e* is known to be narrow, either by their etymology or by the authority of Faidit. In this way we may account for those passages in this poem, where four consecutive lines end in *-es*. In such cases the rime is only apparent; the one couplet contains the wide *e*-rime, the other the narrow *e*; e. g., verses 6146-9. This distinction between *-és* and *-ès* being thus established, it remains to ascertain the cause of this difference. The *-és* is produced only by verbs in *-er* and *-re*; the *-ès* by a few in *-er* and *-re*, and always by verbs in *-ar*. Question is, to find the principle common to verbs in *-ar* and to the few in *-er* and *-re*, which have *-ès* in the imperfect of the subjunctive. It is this: they all have the preterit in *-ét*. The rule may be stated, then, thus: all verbs which form the third pers. sing. of the preterit in *-ét*, give *-ès* in the imperfect subjunctive. On the other hand, in verbs whose preterit does not end in *-ét*, the force of the Latin termination *-issem* remains intact and gives *-és*. This rule seems to be so exact, that in those verbs of the second and third conjugations, which have two preterits (one in *-ét*), there are two imperfect subjunctives, one in *-ès*, the other in *-és*. Thus *respondre* makes *respondèt* and *respos* and *respondès* and *resposés*. These distinctions are very generally observed in the rimes. It is only by negligent rimers after the thirteenth century and by foreigners, who wrote in the *langue d'oc*, that *-és* and *-ès* are confounded and made to rime with each other.

La vie de Saint Alexi en vers octosyllabiques, ed. by G. Paris. Under this heading Gaston Paris published an old French poem, the date of whose composition, to judge from the versification, would fall somewhere near the latter part of the twelfth century. This poem was printed as early as 1856 in the *Mémoires de l'Académie de Caen*, but as this impression is now difficult of access, students of early French philology will be very thankful for the present reprint. Of the language of the poem, which consists of 964 lines, there is nothing very special to say. The author sometimes adds an *s* to nominatives, where none existed in Latin. Of more importance than this, is the use of the oblique case for that of the subject. Neither the dialect of the poem nor the copyist of the manuscript can be determined with any degree of certainty. The vocabulary as well as the style has a somewhat archaic cast at times, but the latter is usually very clear and simple, as the following lines, the prologue, will show:

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Bone parole boen leu tient ; | Por ce m'es pris talant de dire |
| Et cil qui l'ot et la retient | 10 Un conte de bone matire |
| Et met a ovre fet que sage ; | Por crestiens edifier, |
| Et cil ne fet pas son damage | Et pour ce que il m'est mestier |
| 5 Qui la dit, enceis fet son preu | Que bone parole me tienge |
| Vers Deu, qui en tens et en leu | Boen leu vers Deu, qui me meintenge |
| Li merira, ge n'en dout rien : | 15 En son servise, et tel me face |
| Kar il guerredone tot bien. | Qui je le veie face a face. |

Traité catalans de grammaire et de poétique is a continuation, by Paul Meyer, of various ancient treatises on grammar and the poetic art, which he began to publish in Vol. VI of the Romania for 1877. He then gave Las reglas de trobar of Raimon Vidal and Doctrina de compondre dictats. The present number contains the third of these treatises, which has as its title Doctrina de cort [d'acort]. It is a metrical version of the Razos de trobar of R. Vidal, and is the work of a Pisan, Terramagnino by name. As might be expected, it possesses but little interest or value as a grammatical treatise. The beginning of the Proema is somewhat amusing as applied to the subject to be treated :

En lo nom de Dieu qu'es subiranz,
Paire e fill e esperitz sanz,
E guidanz de totz pecadors.

Unfortunately his deity did not prove a *guidanz* to him ; for numerous sins are to be found in his pages. He does not always understand his model : is incapable of improving on him ; and where he departs from him, it is always to fall into error. The Pisan's chief originality lies in the examples cited by him from the troubadours in illustration of his rules. His definitions of the parts of speech are usually quaint, but at times quite pointed ; as in line 81, where, after stating that *emperayre*, *reys* and *baron* are substantives, he continues :

E totas autras qui en ver
Mostron substansa qui vezer
Se pot o qui vezer nos pot.

Strophes au Saint Esprit, etc. The manuscript here published for the first time, by Michel Cohendy and Antoine Thomas, belongs to the archives of the department of Puy-de-Dôme, and contains : 1) Des strophes en l'honneur du Saint Esprit ; 2) Les statuts versifiés d'une confrérie du Saint Esprit ; and 3) Une petite prière à la Vierge. The whole consists of 435 verses, in the Auvergnat dialect, as the editors assert. At the end, the copyist adds eight verses in French, stating that he completed his task on the 6th of July "l'an de grace mil cinq centz et sept" (1507). The work itself is of a much earlier date. Numerous forms would seem to indicate that its composition is to be placed somewhere in the thirteenth, possibly in the twelfth century. The Strophes au Saint Esprit are forty-two in number, of six verses each, and rime as follows : *a, a, a, b, a, b* ; *b* is always a rime in *-it*, while *a*, with one exception, is always a paroxytone rime, e. g. :

Qui mal faict et lou ben sella,
Aquel s'art com ly chandela.
3 Tant sec l'arania la tella

Tro c'a lo corps consumit
Et lo sec tand no sen s'ela
6 Damnal corps et l'esperit.

The "statuts" are in riming couplets, while the "prière" rimes : *a, a, a, a, a, b, b, b, b, b*. The editors are very positive that the dialect is Auvergnat, and for this reason, because the manuscript was found at Saint-Julien de Coppel, near Billom, and because of the constant use of *ch* representing Latin *c* before *a*, the nominative feminine article *li* and *ly* and the notation *gh* for the soft sound of *g* (= *dj*) before *a* and *o*. To settle the dialect on such flimsy grounds is surely a most unscientific proceeding. A number of words in these pieces

are not contained in Raynouard's *Lexique*. *Atassa*, *acala*, *gauchat*, *anfara*, *agenda*, *jangot* are obscure as to their meaning; but the following are clear enough: *agualla*, inf. *agualar*=*égaliser* (Rayn. *agular*); *aünit*, inf. *aümir*=*réunir* (Rayn. *aüinar*); *durmida*, fem. part.=sleep; *hostala*, inf. *hostalar*, to receive hospitality; and *revelhos* (*revel*), rebellious, obstinate.

Henry Carnoy gives a number of interesting Contes, petites légendes, croyances populaires, coutumes, formulettes, jeux d'enfants, which he collected at Warloy-Baillon (Somme) and Mailly. These are in a certain sense a continuation of the series of similar stories, etc., which he began to contribute to the *Melusine* before it suspended.

Etymologies. J. Ulrich proposes a new class of participles formed on the model of *comestus* from *comère* (*comedere*). In this way he would derive *amonestar* (Sp. and Prov.) from *monestus* (*monère*) and *carestia* from *carestus* (*carère*). (For the latter A. Tobler thinks the Gr. ἀχαριστία would suffice.) Ulrich further offers *disvadere* as the origin of *desver*, which, he says, may have first been modified by *du sens* (*desver du sens*), then have dropped the adjunct, and finally added the reflexive *se*. G. Paris, however, thinks this derivation questionable. Tobler had formerly proposed to explain *sancier* and *essancier* by *exentiare*. As this would lead us to expect a form *essencier* and not *essancier*, Paris assumes a verb *sanitiare* from *sanitia* for *sanitas*. There is nothing to support this conjecture of Mr. Paris. No such post-classic form as *sanitia* is found; moreover, *sanitia* would not have given the substantive *santé*, but *sanesse*, which does not occur.

No. 31. The libraries of Cambridge, England, have not, up to the present time, furnished any material for the history of the French language and literature, although they contain numerous French manuscripts on a variety of subjects, dating from the twelfth century. Chansons de geste, poems of adventure, didactic poems, lives of saints and chronicles may all be found here in abundance; while the aid rendered to the student seeking information is said to be of the most cordial kind. Owing to the lack of suitable catalogues of these manuscripts, the search is somewhat difficult and discouraging; and this may account for the fact of Romance scholars having hitherto neglected Cambridge for Oxford, where the facilities are most ample. Mr. Paul Meyer, during the last eight years, has made frequent visits to Cambridge for the purpose of copying and bringing to light some of these treasures. It was his original intention to print the results of his labors in the Archives des Missions, but his matter having become too voluminous for the space allowed by the Archives, he has concluded to publish it in the Romania, No. 31 of which begins with the manuscripts of St. John's College Library. In selecting the works to be printed he has been guided by the wish to give only such as would throw some light on the history and development of the language. A prefatory note describing the manuscript and its place of deposit is affixed to each piece. There are represented four manuscripts (B. 9, F. 30, G. 5 and I. 11), which contain the following poems: [La Bonté des femmes]; Chrestien, Vie de S. Guillaume d'Angleterre; Description de la terre d'Outremer; Mirabilia Romae; Poésie en forme de pastourelle du 14 e. siècle; La petite philosophie; Pierre de Peckham; Les quinze signes; Le roman de la rose; La somme le Roi; Vie de Sainte Paule en prose; Wace, la Conception; and William de Waddington.

Mr. Gaston Paris gives a lengthy analysis and study of the Roman du châtelain de Couci. He aims to establish the name of the author of this Roman, which has not been heretofore made out. The poet himself states that his name is contained in a certain passage of twenty lines. Mr. Paris thinks this is an acrostic; and by shifting the initial letters about to suit his own fancy, he builds up the following most outlandish looking name: Jakemon (or Jakeme) Sakesep. No one will, of course, accept this, owing to the juggling process by which it is arrived at. Mr. Paris, however, in accordance with his usual dogmatism, is so certain that he is right that he continually refers to the poet by this name in the succeeding part of his article, which is occupied with an examination of the sources and historical basis of the Roman. It may be remarked that this article is to appear in the twenty-ninth volume of the *Histoire littéraire de la France*, now in press.

Chute de l médiale dans quelques pays de langue d'oc. The falling out of medial *l*, so common in Portuguese, has been, for a long time, thought to be peculiar to that language and unique in the Romance languages; and this phenomenon was sought to be explained by local influence, either Basque or Iberian. In the Romania for 1877 (p. 396), Mr. Cornu called attention to a number of words, in the language of the Vallée de Bagnes, in which *l* between two vowels had been dropped. Mr. O. Nigoles has been studying this subject with reference to the langue d'oc, and he finds that, in some of its dialects, the disappearance of the medial *l* is quite common, at least in the language as spoken at the present day. Two classes of facts are noticed by him, which he states as follows: 1) *l* vocalisée est absorbée, dans le corps des mots, par le voisinage de *u*, venant soit de *ū*, *ũ*, soit de *ō*, *õ*; 2) elle disparaît entre deux voyelles et à la fin des mots, mais pour une autre cause et en suivant une marche différente: la disparition de la liquide a été précédée du changement de *l* en *r*.

Before entering upon the special theme, he gives the general treatment of the letter under discussion. It is this: *l* initial remains intact; single *l* in the interior of words becomes *u* (*alam*, *auo*); when final, it is vocalized (*aprilem*, *obriou*), as also before labials, gutturals and *m*, *n* (*albam*, *auo*: *calcare*, *kouka*; *palmam*, *paumo*; *alenam*, *auno*); but before dentals and *r*, *s*, *z*, vocalization is rare (*altare*, *olta*); in this latter position it is so strong as to assimilate the following *d* (*excaldare*, *eskolla*); it becomes *n* by assimilation in *in altum*=*nalt*=*nant*, and in *nos alteros*=*nantres*; *l* mouillée, however, is preserved but as a single *l* (*callosum*, *kolus*), likewise in diminutives in *-ellus*, *-ella*. Passing on from this general fate of the *l*, which I have but partially and briefly indicated, Nigoles comes to the discussion of the cases, where this letter disappears entirely. This discussion occupies thirteen pages, and, though exceedingly interesting, it cannot be given even in brief. A few instances must suffice. Preceded or followed by *u*, *l* disappears: *bodula*, *buo* (see Diez Etym. Wört. II c. *borne*); *talonem*, *tolu*, *tou*. This disappearance of *l* is probably due to its fusion with the *u*; so that it is hardly right for Nigoles to say that the treatment of *l* in *talonem*, *tolu*, *touu*, *tou*, is essentially different from *albam*, *auo*. The *u* in *tou* may as well be the vocalized *l* as the other *u*. The majority of the instances cited by him seem to be susceptible of this explanation; e. g., atonic *ō*, *õ* becoming *u* in *in-solare* and *solatam*, we should have *esuua*, *esua* and *sulado*, *suuado*, *suado*. It may further be remarked that this falling out of the *l* is by no

means constant: *calorem, kolur* and *kour*; *colorem, kulur*; *mulam, mulo*, etc. This study of Nigoles has been confined to the canton Saint-Amans-des-Cots and a part of Sainte-Geneviève.

Le Sacrifice d'Abraham, mystère engadinois, will be found of much interest to those who have not met specimens of this dialect before.

Of the new etymologies, those by Wedgwood may be noted as most plausible. *Agacer* from O. H. G. *hwassi*, M. H. G. *wasse*, an edge; hence to urge, to *egg* (A. S. *ecg*=edge). M. H. G. *wetzen* conveys the same sense: "Sus begunde in *wetzen* unde reizen uf de têt," and Eng. *whet* is used in the same metaphorical way: "When she to murder *whets* the timorous thane." In Rabelais, *esguasser les dens* seems to point directly to some such derivation as *wasse*. In support of the derivation of *blaireau* from *bladarius*, a corn-dealer, he offers a passage from Herrick to show that the popular belief of the seventeenth century regarded the *badger* as a hoarder of grain: "Some thin chippings the mice filcht from the bin of the *gray* farmer."

Guignon, ill-luck, is commonly taken from *guigner*, to look askew. A more satisfactory origin may be found in O. E. *wanion*, chiefly used in the expression, *with a wanion!* synonymous with the Irish curse, *bad luck to you!*

In the Eng. argot of thieves, to stand in the pillory was to "peep through the nut-cracker," to play bo-peep. Catalan *espillera*, a loophole, may explain Prov. *espitlori* and Fr. *pilori*, from *specula* through *specularium*.

Sentinelle, he thinks, first meant the beat or path of the guard, being a double diminutive from O. Fr. *sente*, a path. A passage cited by Littré seems to give it this fundamental meaning: "qui se fasche quand on l'appelle à la *sentinelle*," etc. Also *lever* or *relever de sentinelle* may mean to relieve by taking from the beat. This derivation would explain the feminine gender of the word. He connects *sombrer* with O. N. *sumbla*, to overwhelm, Eng. to *swamp*, and Sw. dialect *sumppa*, to drown.

SAMUEL GARNER.